

VOLUME XXIX

NUMBER 2

THE
HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

APRIL 1936

AN EASTERN CHRISTIAN SECT: THE ATHINGANOI *Joshua Starr* 93

PROVIDENTIA AND AETERNITAS *Martin Percival Charlesworth* 107

THE POSITION OF HEBREWS IN THE CANON OF THE NEW
TESTAMENT *William H. P. Hatch* 133



CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1936

Issued Quarterly

\$3.00 a Year

Single Numbers \$1.00

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Issued quarterly by the Faculty of Divinity in
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Editorial Committee

ARTHUR D. NOCK

WILLARD L. SPEERY
J. A. C. F. AUER

GEORGE LA PIANA
HENRY J. CADBURY

The *Harvard Theological Review* is maintained on the foundation established under the will of Mildred Everett, daughter of Charles Carroll Everett, Bussey Professor of Theology in Harvard University, 1869-1900, and Dean of the Faculty of Divinity, 1878-1900.

The scope of the Review embraces theology, ethics, the history and philosophy of religion, and cognate subjects. It aims to publish investigations, discussions, and reviews which contribute to the enlargement of knowledge or the advance of thought.

Remittances and communications on business matters should be addressed to the *Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts*.

PUBLISHED BY THE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHERS OF THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

*Entered as second-class mail matter January 2, 1903, at the post-office at Boston, Mass.
under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.*

*Acceptance for mailing at special postage rate provided for by Section 1103, Act of
October 3, 1917, authorized on July 31, 1918.*

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXIX

APRIL, 1936

NUMBER 2

AN EASTERN CHRISTIAN SECT: THE ATHINGANOI

JOSHUA STARR

NEW YORK CITY

TO THE MEMORY OF PROF. ANDRÉAS MICHAEL ANDRÉADÈS
(1877-1935)

'ALL heresies issue out of your midst,' said Liutprand to the emperor and his court at Constantinople, and the statement was essentially correct. But he went too far in implying that they flourished without interference by the orthodox regime, so that it was left to the Latins to exterminate them in the course of their westward spread.¹ One could draw up a fairly long catalogue of sects which are known to have existed on Byzantine soil for a time, only to succumb to official persecution or to become extinct in some unrecorded manner. Practically all of these have passed on leaving no tangible trace of their peculiar beliefs or practices, yet a study of any one of them offers the opportunity of filling in to some extent the picture of life in the variegated Eastern Empire. The subject of this study is the latest of the several sects which arose in Phrygia, and despite a brief and limited history, did not disappear without having an emperor credited to it, nor without perpetuating its name in the variants whereunder the gypsies are known in Europe to the present day.

The handful of references relating to the external history of the Athinganoi deals principally with the activities of certain emperors before or after accession. We hear of them first at the opening of the ninth century in the chronicle of Theophanes. They appear here together with the Paulicians of Phrygia and Lycaonia as the favored supporters of Nikephoros (802-11), then general of the army in Asia Minor. The future

¹ *Relatio de legatione constantinopolitana*, xxii, ed. J. Becker. *Die Werke Liutprands von Cremona*, 3rd ed., Hannover, 1915, 186 f.

emperor was a native of that region, and the hostile chronicler frowns on his impious trust in the magical devices of the two sects.² Of course, Theophanes was an ardently orthodox Christian writing in a period when the struggle with the iconoclastic party was still smoldering, and although the reign of Nikephoros is not marked by any active steps on behalf of the latter, his tolerance toward it contrasted sharply with the policy of Irene, whose throne he usurped, and who had been imperial consort in 787, the year of the restoration of the icons. Hence, we can understand his condemnation of this emperor as a benighted heretic, without too readily accepting as fact his personal encouragement of the sects in question.³

The situation during the brief reign of the succeeding ruler, Michael I (811-13), was quite the reverse. For under the influence of such fanatics as Nikephoros, the patriarch of Constantinople, the death-penalty was decreed for all Paulicians and Athinganoi.⁴ But this extreme measure evoked serious opposition,⁵ particularly on the part of the great Theodore of Studion,⁶ so that the sentence was presently commuted to banishment and confiscation of property. The execution of this order on the Athinganoi was entrusted to Leo, general of the Anatolic theme,⁷ and, as will shortly appear, this probably meant the transference of a portion of the sect to the western provinces.

² Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. K. de Boor, Leipzig, 1883, 488, A. M. 6303: τῶν δὲ Μανιχαίων, τῶν νῦν Παυλικιάνων καλούμενων, καὶ Ἀθιγγάνων . . . φίλος ἦν διάπυρος, χρησμοῖς καὶ τελεταῖς αὐτῶν ἐπιχαίρων. . . . Cf. Kedrénos (12th c.), *Synopsis historion*, Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, CXXI, 924; Zonaras, *Epitome historion*, vol. III, ed. T. Büttner-Wobst, Bonn, 1897, 308. The latter expressly shows that Theophanes' epithet, 'Manichees,' does not apply to the Athinganoi.

³ See J. B. Bury, *A history of the Eastern Roman Empire*, London, 1912, 38; A. Vasiliev, *Histoire de l'empire byzantin*, Paris, 1932, I, 373.

⁴ Theophanes, 494 f., A. M. 6304. Ignatios, likewise a contemporary, states that a tract written by the patriarch influenced the emperor (presumably Michael I) to suppress the religions of the Jews, the Phrygians, and the Manichees. See the biography, ed. de Boor with the *Opuscula historica* of Nikephoros, Leipzig, 1880, 158 f. Bury, op. cit., 40.

⁵ See E. J. Martin, *A history of the Iconoclastic movement*, London, 1932, 156. This writer takes the peculiar position that it was the patriarch who dissuaded the emperor from taking such extreme measures.

⁶ See A. P. Dobroklonski, *Prep. Theodor ispovyednik i igumen Studiiskii*, Odessa, 1914, I, 715, with reference to PG, XCIX, 1485.

⁷ Theophanes, 497.

If the emperor had supposed that his will could so be carried out that no Athinganoi would be left behind in heresy-ridden Phrygia, he would have been quite mistaken. For we know from Genesios that they continued to flourish there, particularly in Amorion, the birth-place of Michael II (820-9). It was a soothsayer of this sect who was believed to have predicted his accession, while he was still an obscure army-officer. But notwithstanding the fact that Amorion seems to have been noted for its numerous Athinganoi, and that certain late sources emphasize the allegation that Michael was reared within the sect, neither Genesios nor the emperor's semi-contemporary, George the Monk, know aught of his participation in its life.⁸

Now although Michael as emperor did favor iconoclasm, the most recent studies have concluded that he did not persecute the orthodox party to any serious degree.⁹ Yet it was sufficient that he personally leaned toward the heretics and that he blocked the restoration of image-worship for later chroniclers to expand the few sober details furnished by Genesios into a veritable diatribe. We begin first with the anonymous continuator of Theophanes, who succeeded the former within very few years. In his account Michael is presented as an Athinganos by birth and upbringing, who manifested the influence of this sect in his imperial administration in a number of ways. But whereas Genesios saw no need to dwell on the idiosyncrasies of the sect, the popular purpose of our pious chronicler required that he enlighten his readers with respect to its unchristian character. The Athinganoi, he explained, were a sect of Judaizers, a circumstance resulting from the fact that Amorion, its chief seat, had long harbored a large community of Jews.¹⁰ (The latter notion was undoubtedly inspired by Genesios'

⁸ Genesios, Basileiai, PG, CIX, 1025-8: οὐχ ἥττον δὲ καὶ ἐπίμωμος ἀπὸ τε τῆς πατρίδος αὐτοῦ Ἀθηγγάνων πλῆθον ἐκτρεφούσης. (Written ca. 950.) Bury, op. cit., 79 f. Based on this passage are the slightly later notices in Theophanes continuatus, PG, CIX, 57-9, 65; cf. also, Kedrénos, 953-6, and Zonaras, 337 f. The theory of H. Grégoire, Byzantion, IX, 1934, 202, that Genesios and Theop. cont. are dependent on a common source, has yet to be proved.

⁹ Dobroklonski, op. cit., 849; Vasiliev, op. cit., 376.

¹⁰ I.e., 56. Unlike Bury, op. cit., 78, Martin, op. cit., 199, interprets the passage to mean that the sect in question was a third group intermediate to the Jews and Athinganoi. It is true that the chronicler's language does not preclude this view, but why

casual reference to the local Jews.¹¹) In order to insure the influence of Judaism in their lives, each family secured for itself a Jew or Jewess as mentor, who lived with the household and managed all its affairs, both spiritual and temporal. The result was that the sect observed all the laws of Moses, though refraining from circumcision on the one hand, and practicing Christian baptism on the other. Having been raised in such an atmosphere, was it not, from the standpoint of the writer and his readers, readily understandable why Michael grew up to become a wretched iconoclast, who loved the Jews more than the Christians, and why he even declared the former tax-exempt?¹²

If such a wild tale could arise in the tenth century, we need not be surprised at the twelfth-century chronicler, Zonaras, who sums up the calumny against Michael II with the statement that 'he belonged to the Jews.'¹³ Then, toward the end of the century Michael the Syrian recorded the crowning calumny that the emperor was descended from a Jewish grandfather!¹⁴ The false, sensational tone of all of this material cannot fail to arouse some suspicion when the texts are thus confronted one with the other. Yet imperative as such a process of criticism would seem, certain scholars have totally neglected it and then proceeded to take the passage on the Athinganoi in the anonymous chronicler in all seriousness.¹⁵

look for precision in such a work? Ephraim, author of a rhymed chronicle in the 13th c., makes the emperor to have been only a friend of the Athinganoi; PG, CXLIII, 93, line 2195.

¹¹ I.e., 1072 f.

¹² I.e., 61. Cf. the suspicion expressed by F. Dölger, *Die Frage der Judensteuer in Byzanz*, *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, XXVI, 1933, 11.

¹³ p. 339. Figuratively and literally orthodox writers believed that the instigators of the iconoclastic movement were Jews. See Martin, *op. cit.*, 24, and J. Starr, *An iconodulic legend and its historical basis*, *Speculum*, VIII, 1933, 501-3.

¹⁴ *Makhtebhānūth zabhnē* (Chronique), ed. and tr. J. B. Chabot. Paris, 1899-1924, IV, 522; tr. III, 72. Copied by Bar Hebraeus, *Makhtebhānūth zabhnē*, ed. P. Bedjan, Paris, 1890, 141. (Comparison with the former shows that *qashish* here cannot signify 'priest' as in the translation of E. A. W. Budge, *The chronography of Gregory Abū'l Faraj*, London, 1932, 129.)

¹⁵ Pre-eminently, G. Caro, *Ein jüdischer Proselyt (?) auf dem Thron von Byzanz*, *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, LIII, 1909, 576-80; S. Krauss, *Studien zur byzantinisch-jüdischen Geschichte*, Vienna, 1914, 41. Both limited to the account of the anonymous chronicler (n. 10).

Before entering into a consideration of the inner life of the sect, attention must be directed to a source which reveals that in the ninth century there were Athinganoi in Europe, specifically in Aegina, the home of the abbottess Athanasia, who extended charity to them during a famine.¹⁶ The presence of this sect in this western region is undoubtedly due to the exile order executed in the reign of Michael I, rather than to the earlier transportations of heretics from Asia Minor.¹⁷ For the dating of this particular reference it is important to note that earlier in the life of Athanasia the island had been raided by Arabs (Μαυρούσιοι), who presumably had come by way of Crete. This gives us as the *post quem* approximately the year 830.¹⁸

Toward the middle of the succeeding century, the emperor Constantine VII (913-59) is commended by a contemporary theological writer for having engaged in disputations with representatives of this heresy as well as with Paulicians (οὐκ ὀλίγους δὲ τῶν Ἀνθιγγάνων [*sic*] καὶ Παυλικιάνων διήλεγξας). This statement occurs in the introduction to an anti-Monophysite tract composed at the emperor's behest by Demetrios, metropolitan of Cyzicus, and assuming that the reference to the Athinganoi is not due merely to association of ideas, its importance lies both in its indication of the survival of the sect to that time, and in its suggestion of the existence of certain doctrines peculiar to it.¹⁹ For, as will presently appear, the practices of the Athinganoi have been recorded, but not their theological views.

¹⁶ Latin version of the life, ed. J. Pien, *Acta Sanctorum*, Aug., III, 1867, 170. Cf. C. Loparev, *Vizantiiski Vremennik*, XIX (1915), 81; L. Bréhier, *Byzantion*, I, 1924, 186 f. On Athanasia see F. Rémy in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, IV, 1930, 1400.

¹⁷ See M. Wellnhofer, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXX, 1930, 481.

¹⁸ See A. A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, Brussels, 1935, I, 57.

¹⁹ G. Ficker, *Erlasse des Patriarchen von Konstantinopel Alexios Studites*, Kiel, 1911, 22, n. The body of the tract without the portion cited here is printed under false authorship in PG, CXXVII, 879-84. For certain reasons Ficker preferred to identify δεσπότην Κωνσταντίνου καὶ αὐτοκράτορος τοῦ Πορφυρογεννήτου as Constantine VIII (1025-8), since there is a contemporary writer named Demetrios, who was shortly thereafter appointed to the same metropolitanship. But the identification, which is surprisingly late for the Athinganoi as a living sect, has, because of the terms in which the emperor is addressed, not met with approval. See L. Petit, *Dict. de Théol. cath.*, IV, 264 f. (1911); R. Janin, *l.c.*, XII, 60 (1933).

The study of our sect in its inner aspects is dependent on the information contained in the formula of abjuration appertaining to it, in an orthodox tract written concerning the heresy, and in a certain briefer statement of similar tenor. It seems appropriate to use the formula of abjuration²⁰ as the starting-point, since it contains all the essential known facts. This document is, however, complicated by the unknown author's theory that the ancient Melkisedekites and Theodotians were so closely related to the latter-day heresy, that it was appropriate to provide but one formula for use in the baptism of a convert from either of the three sects. Nevertheless, it is clear that his main concern was the Athinganoi, and in the translation to be given here it will be best to exclude the briefer references to the other two groups.

. . . I also anathematize the successive teachers of the Athinganoi in each generation of the past, those of today, and those of the future.²¹ . . . I anathematize those who observe the Sabbath like the Jews, while contemning circumcision and baptism like the Gentiles. I anathematize those who resort to divination, charms, and magic, and promise to harm and to benefit men therewith. I anathematize those who invoke certain demons, the chief of them being Sōrou, Sochan, and Arche, and with their aid draw the moon to themselves, asking of it any questions they wish. I anathematize those who give the stars men's names, and who with their demonic fancy strive to incite them one against the other, saying thus: This star shall extinguish that, and this is greater and more propitious than all the others. I anathematize those who under pretense of purity teach misanthropy, considering all outside their faith defiled, and who, therefore, do not permit themselves to approach nor to be approached by any of those, nor to give nor to take anything by the hand of one of them. If by accident anything like that should occur, they immediately hurry away for their purifications and baths, as having been defiled and rendered impure. In addition I anathematize every other custom or ceremony or observance of the Athinganoi, practised secretly or openly by them.²¹

As a preface to the foregoing instrument certain manuscripts contain a tract entitled Concerning the Melkisedekites, the

²⁰ PG, CVI, 1033-6. For an old Slavic tr. of the 12th c. see A. A. Dimitrievski, *Bogoslushenie v russkoi tserkvi v XVI v. Kazan, 1884*, I, 55 f. Cited by V. N. Beneševich in *Evreiskaya Misl*, II, 1926, 212, n.

²¹ These are stereotyped statements, like several others omitted here, common to the several formulas. See V. V. Ermoni, *Abjurations*, in *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie*, I, pt. 1, 98-103 (1907).

Theodotians, and the Athinganoi.²² This gives no new information of any value, and since it is designed for a less practical purpose than the formula, is not framed as concisely. With regard to Sabbath-observance and circumcision, our author differs somewhat in stating that 'when they are in the company of Jews, they pretend to observe the Sabbath, although otherwise they form part of the Gentiles, wherefore they shun circumcision and baptism.' He then describes how 'in the manner of the Thessalian witches of old,'²³ they direct incantations at the moon in order to compel it to descend from the heavens into the waters of a spring, bringing an answer regarding the fate of some individual. They may also 'give the stars in the western sky the names of those against whom evil is being sought. . . .' Again, by means of their incantations they can get the three demon-chiefs to cause a certain star to bring calamity down upon a person by extinguishing the light protecting him. Thus, they finally drag their clients down to destruction. In order to impress their observers they imitate the Novatians and their offshoot the Sabbatians, exclaiming, 'Touch me not, for I am pure!' Their name, we are told, derives from this peculiar attitude. But whether or not that etymology is admissible,²⁴ the analogy of the Novatians is false, and is suggested merely by the fact that the latter sect styled itself the *Kαθαροί*,²⁵ for entirely unrelated reasons.

Among the problems raised by the two foregoing writings is that of dating. With respect to the formula of abjuration, the question is bound up with that of the other materials in its

²² Text in G. Ficker, *Eine Sammlung von Abschwörungsformeln*, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XXVII, 1906, 450-2. Overlooked by G. Bardy, *Revue Biblique*, XXXVI, 1927, 38, who gives an abridged tr. from the ms.

²³ See Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, XXX, ii, 2. Cf. M. Summers, *The geography of witchcraft*, New York, 1927, 9.

²⁴ It is surprising that neither in this nor in the preceding document is the verb *θεγγάνειν* employed, as it is in Col. 2: 21. The present writer doubts whether the etymology given is trustworthy.

²⁵ See, e.g., E. Amann in *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*, XI, 840 (1931). Herein may lie the explanation for the statement that Michael II was a Sabbatian, made in the life of the patriarch Ignatios by Nikétas Paphlagōn, PG, CV, 493. (For the disputed dating of this writing see N. Iorga, *Histoire de la Vie byzantine*, Bucharest, 1934, III, 202.) Cf., however, Martin, *op. cit.*, 199, n. 5.

class. However, inasmuch as no comprehensive investigation of this aspect of the subject has as yet been made, no definitive solution has been offered. One may cite the opinion of Beneševich that the original formula for converts from Judaism was composed under Justinian, and was rendered into a more elaborate form in the beginning of the eleventh century.²⁶ The one for Moslems has been assigned to the latter eighth century or later by Henri Lammens,²⁷ an eminent authority on Islam. This estimate corresponds fairly closely to the generally accepted opinion which would place the formulas for Manichees and Athinganoi in the ninth century,²⁸ the period to which the datable references to the latter are limited. As for our anonymous tract, it seems just as likely for it to be an enlarged presentation of the material in the formula, as for the latter to be an adaptation of the former. To the mind of the present writer the first alternative seems preferable, but in the absence of definite proofs neither view can be considered sufficiently well-grounded. As a *terminus ad quem* for the tract the eleventh century seems appropriate, since it is at that time that we find the earliest use of the name of our sect as denoting the gypsies, as will be shown below.

In addition to the formula and the tract the peculiarities of the Athinganoi are related in very similar fashion in a passage included in a treatise on the heresies by one Timotheos of Constantinople, a presbyter of Hagia Sophia, and of the Church of the Virgin in Chalkoprateia.²⁹ On the basis of his reference to the Council of 553 and of the fact that he does not mention the Monothelites, this work has been generally dated between the former year and 622,³⁰ although some scholars have cast doubt

²⁶ See his Russian article referred to in n. 20.

²⁷ *Mélanges de la Faculté orientale de l'Université St. Joseph*, VI, 1913, 488-90.

²⁸ See the references in Ficker, l.c., 46-53; Beneševich, l.c., ib. The Vatican ms. bears the rubric of a writing by the patriarch Methodios (843-7), printed in PG, C, 1300-25. (See Goar's note 1.) Unaware of the scribe's error, the authorship was so accepted by F. Miklosich, *Über die Mundarten und Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europas*, vi, Denkschriften der Vienna K. Akademie der Wiss., phil.-hist. Classe, XXVI, 1877, 57 f.

²⁹ PG, LXXXVI, pt. 1, 33; tr. Bardy, l.c., 37.

³⁰ See the note of F. Combes, PG, LXXXVI, pt. 1, 11, n. 1. Cf. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altchristliche Literatur*, Berlin, 1932, V, 26.

on this as being too early.³¹ But even if the former view is accepted, it is a mistake to consider the passage in question our earliest reference, for it can be demonstrated that the section on the Athinganoi is a later insertion.

The treatise generally is divided into three distinct parts, the first dealing with those heretics who must undergo baptism upon conversion to orthodoxy, and the second with those who need only to be anointed with myrrh. The former concludes with the followers of Pelagius and Celestinus, after which the writer gives an explicit closing statement: *Οὗτοι οὖν ἅπαντες . . . τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ σωτηριώδους βαπτίσματος χρῆζουσιν*. Succeeding this we find not the beginning of the second section but instead the passage which concerns us, under the heading: 'There is yet another heresy, the Melkisedekites.' This appellation, we are informed, is now borne by the Athinganoi of Phrygia, who are neither Jews nor Gentiles, since they observe the Sabbath but refrain from circumcision. The etymology of their name is then given, much as in the anonymous tract, and the passage concludes with the rule that, like the other heretics listed up to this point, these must be baptized on conversion. Now it is most unlikely that the original author would have disturbed his plan in this fashion; hence, unless valid objection can be raised against the detection of this passage as a later addition, there is no reason to assume that it is of earlier authorship than the formula of abjuration.

The point has now been reached where it is appropriate to survey the principal characteristics of our sect, in terms of the surrounding culture. It is clear that the Athinganoi practiced an exaggerated levitical purity, that they indulged in astrological, demonic, and magical pursuits, and that they observed the seventh day as the Sabbath.³² With regard to baptism the sources give conflicting testimony. But an indication of what was most likely the true situation may be derived by considering this question as it relates to the Paulicians. Here too the

³¹ Ficker, l.c.; Beneshevich, l.c., 201, contended that the author of this work was really Nikon of Raithu (ca. 1050), without attempting to prove the point. In view of the fact that the latter had compiled a table of contents to this work of Timotheos (PG, LXXXVI, pt. 1, 70), the idea seems untenable.

³² The anonymous chronicler (n. 10), however, charges Michael II not with resting

orthodox critics maintained that the heretics rejected baptism, not because this was indeed the case, but because the sacrament was postponed until the attainment of adulthood.³³

As has been seen, the Athinganoi are represented as the successors of the Melkisedekites, and among modern scholars some have accepted³⁴ while others suspected the authenticity of the connection.³⁵ The former view assumes that the earlier sect survived until the rise of the later one. But the latest references to the existence of the Melkisedekites are of the fifth century, four hundred years before we hear of their alleged successors.³⁶ It appears that our writers were somewhat troubled by the fact that the Athinganoi had no known heresiarchs nor any theological doctrines, and the gap was filled in by bringing them into relation with the Melkisedekites and Theodotians. It should also be observed that the reports concerning our heresy differ from the others of this period in not attributing to it any of the weird and depraved practices such as are, for instance, related of the Euchites of Thrace.³⁷

The peculiar trait from which our sect reputedly got its name is one which characterized a group among the Ebionites several centuries earlier, and is traceable to Samaritan influence. It appears, moreover, in Christian literature in the account of the Samaritans, particularly the followers of Dositheos,³⁸ and, in-

on the Jewish Sabbath but with declaring it a fast-day. In Ephraim, l.c., line 2199, this becomes 'he delighted in Sabbaths and New Moons.' But it is nowhere stated that he decreed Sabbath-observance in the Jewish sense, as is said by L. Bréhier, *La querelle des images*, Paris, 1904, 45.

³³ See F. C. Conybeare, *The key of truth*, Oxford, 1898, xxxiv, xlviii.

³⁴ E.g., G. Bart in *Eleutheroudake Enkyklopaideion Lexikon*, I, 405 (1928). Another writer represents the Athinganoi as revering Melkisedek as an ascetic hero; G. Wuttke, *Melchisedech der Priesterkönig von Salem*, Giessen, 1927, 35.

³⁵ See Bardy, l.c., 35 f.

³⁶ I. von Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, Munich, 1890, I, 31-3; Bardy, *Rev. Bib.*, XXXVI, 36, 39.

³⁷ See Wellnhofer, l.c., ib.

³⁸ Epiphanius. *Panarion haireseōn*, ix, 3, x, 13, xxx, 2, ed. K. Holl, Epiphanius, *Ancoratus und Panarion*, Leipzig, 1915, I, 200, 205 f., 334. Well analyzed by J. Thomas, *Les Ebionites Baptistes*, *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XXX, 1934, 270-5. See also K. Kohler, *Dositheus the Samaritan heresiarch*, *American Journal of Theology*, XV, 1911, 413, 419 f., 434. For the Semitic evidence (especially Koran 20: 97) respecting the Samaritans, see I. Goldziher, *Lā Misāsa*, *Revue Africaine*, LII, 1908, 23-8; B. Heller, *Al-Sāmīri*, *Encyclopedia of Islam*, IV, 135 f. (1925).

deed, an eleventh century source dubs some gypsies ('Ατσιγκανοί) in Constantinople members of the Samaritan race.³⁹ Seeing that the two groups manifest a similar attitude toward outsiders, one modern scholar has actually been led to conjecture that the original Athinganoi had been Samaritans who were converted to Christianity.⁴⁰ Such an aetiology would, however, be extremely odd, and there are, of course, divers other ways in which the Christian heretics of Phrygia might have become what they were.

As for the combination of astrology with demon-control, this may be a survival from pagan days,⁴¹ and it would constitute a significant step toward the solution of our problem if one could discover the source of the demons Sōrou and Sochan.⁴² It is interesting to find a corroboration of this interest in an Oneirocriticon attributed to the patriarch Nikephoros, the arch-enemy of heretics, wherein a dream in which Athinganoi are seen is interpreted to mean that demons are at hand.⁴³ Similar practices are found among the Throndakians, a Paulician group in Armenia.⁴⁴ It is this reputation for fortune-telling and magical ability, moreover, which explains how the name of our sect came to be transferred to the gypsies upon their appearance in the empire.⁴⁵ As a parallel to such a transfer one

³⁹ See the life of Giorgi Mthatsmidel of Mt. Athos cited in a translation from the Georgian by M. Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie*, Petrograd, 1849, I, 338. Cf. Miklosich, l.c., 58 (Period of Constantine IX, 1042-55). However, the allusion to Simon Magus accounts for the condemnation of these gypsies as Samaritans. An earlier date (855) for the first appearance of the gypsies in the empire was proposed by M. J. de Goeje, *Mémoire sur les migrations des Tsiganes à travers l'Asie*, Leyden, 1903, 74 f. But this has not been accepted; see J. Sampson, *On the origin and early migrations of the Gypsies*, *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*, 3rd s., II, 1923, 157.

⁴⁰ J. Halévy, *Les Samaritains dans le Coran*, *Revue Sémitique*, XVI, 1908, 428 f. (in reply to Goldziher, l.c.; overlooked by Heller, l.c.).

⁴¹ See the remark of Michael Psellos (11th c.), PG, CXXII, 877. Cf. K. Svoboda, *La démonologie de Michel Psellos*, Brno, 1927, 34 f.

⁴² The third one, Ἀρχε = Ἀρχαί, seems to be nothing more than a common term used in the special sense of 'demon-chiefs.'

⁴³ F. Drexl, *Das Traumbuch des Patriarchen Nikephoros*, Festgabe A. Ehrhard zum 60. Geburtstag, Bonn-Leipzig, 1922, 101, line 4: Ἀθιγγάνους νόησον δαίμονας πέλειν. Erroneously taken as a reference to the gypsies, by F. Kattenbusch, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, XLVIII, 1923, 201 f.

⁴⁴ See Wellnhofer, l.c.

⁴⁵ Contra de Goeje, op. cit., 75, who accounts for the transfer on the ground that the

may cite the manner in which the appellation *Mardaïtai*, originally denoting certain troops on the Syrian frontier, came to be applied, honorifically in this instance, to a part of the army in Greece.⁴⁶ It is, of course, also possible that a good part of the heretics merged with the gypsies.

A concrete illustration of the strong similarity between this particular aspect of the practices of the Athinganoi and those of their namesakes is supplied by Balsamon at the end of the twelfth century. The snake-charmers and ventriloquists who are called Athinganoi, he writes, engage in less tangible wonder-working as well. They cast horoscopes, tell fortunes, and, in general, foretell the future, putting them in the same class as the *kritiriai* (?), the false prophets, and the 'hermits.'⁴⁷

There remains now the question of Jewish influence on the Athinganoi, as depicted by the anonymous chronicler cited above, and alluded to in the tract. It was maintained in the discussion of the former source that a comparison with Genesios showed it to be an artificial and untrustworthy representation. But at first blush the observance of the Jewish Sabbath would seem to negate this conclusion. It is true that the direct influence of Jewish neighbors is manifested in that custom, when adopted by certain pagan and Christian groups back in the fourth century⁴⁸ and possibly somewhat later. And it is not to be denied that the fight of the Church against the substitution of the seventh day for the Lord's Day had to be continued for

gypsies were 'étrangers d'aspect et de mœurs singuliers, dont on évitait le contact.' Sampson, l.c., 167, supposes that it was due to the fact that the new group came in by way of Phrygia. See also L. Wiener, Gypsies as fortune-tellers and as blacksmiths, l.c., 2nd s., III, 1909, 15 f.; J. Walker, Nûri, Enc. of Islam, III, 963.

⁴⁶ See K. Papparegopoulos, *Historia tou Hellenikou ethnous*, 5th ed., Athens, 1925, IV, pt. 1, 48.

⁴⁷ PG, CXXXVII, 720 f., 741. Cf. L. Oeconomus, *La vie religieuse dans l'empire byzantin au temps des Commènes et des Anges*, Paris, 1918, 223, n. 3. On the other hand Ficker took this as proof of the late survival of the sect, *Die Phundiagiagiten*, Leipzig, 1908, 272, n. 1. On the 'hermits,' see Wiener, l.c., 275 f.

⁴⁸ With respect to the Hypsistarioi of Cappadocia, see, e.g., G. Bareille, *Dict. de Théol. cath.*, VII, 572 (1922). Canon 29 of the Council of Laodicea (ca. 380) forbade 'Judaizing and resting on the Sabbath'; C. J. Hefele and Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, Paris, 1907, I, 1015.

a number of centuries, but that is no proof that the observers of the Jewish Sabbath as late as the ninth century were Judaizers.⁴⁹ For there are Seventh Day Adventists among us today, who are far removed from any suspicion of Judaism, and it cannot be supposed that the line between the adherents of the two religions was less rigidly drawn in ninth-century Byzantium than it is in the modern western world. It must be recognized that although the Jewish neighbors of the Athinganoi *may* have influenced the heretical practices of the latter, we cannot share the certainty of the anonymous sources respecting the alleged relationship of the two groups.

The opinion is fairly widespread that the Athinganoi were a branch of the Paulician sect,⁵⁰ which is mentioned first by an Armenian writer in the eighth century. This seems to be dependent in part on a superficial reading of certain lines in Kedrenos and Zonaras, unchecked by the passage in Theophanes on which alone both are based. Nevertheless, there is some significance in the fact that the external history of the two groups, as we have seen, shows them sharing the same vicissitudes. We should, consequently, expect the Athinganoi, like the larger group, to have shared the viewpoint of the Iconoclasts, with whom Theophanes in one instance does, indeed, associate them.⁵¹ And undoubtedly this feature, as well as the Sabbatizing, operated on the mind of the anonymous chronicler who attributed Judaizing influences to Michael II. Yet this inference is somewhat weakened by the latest results of research on this movement, which indicate that by the ninth century it had lost much of the support which it commanded in the preceding

⁴⁹ A similar view with respect to the West is expressed by H. Vogelstein and P. Rieger, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, Berlin, 1896, I, 169.

⁵⁰ For the earlier expressions of this theory see F. A. A. Pluquet, *Dictionnaire des Hérésies*, Paris, 1847, I, 470 f.; J. H. Blunt, *Dictionary of sects, heresies, ecclesiastical parties, and schools of religious thought*, Philadelphia, 1874, 58. More recently, e.g., Bréhier, *Dict. d'hist. et de géog. eccl.*, V, 51 (1931). With reference to the anonymous chronicler's description (n. 10), Dobroklonski, *op. cit.*, 849 f., n., simply substitutes the name of the Paulician sect, apparently due to the fact that the original significance of the term Athinganoi was not clear in his mind; cf. *ib.*, 710.

⁵¹ 496. Bréhier, *La querelle*, 40. Cf. Martin, *op. cit.*, 157, who, however, misrenders the passage: 'The two Iconoclastic heresies of the Paulicians and the Athinganoi.' On this agreement between the groups in question see also *ib.*, 275-8.

one among the population of the eastern provinces.⁵² At all events, it must be borne in mind that our sect receives co-ordinate standing with the Paulicians everywhere, with the exception of certain secondary material, so that the ground for considering it only a branch of the latter is quite inadequate.

⁵² Vasiliev, *op. cit.*, 380.

PROVIDENTIA AND AETERNITAS

MARTIN PERCIVAL CHARLESWORTH

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

DURING the first two centuries of the Roman Empire, as the Principate slowly developed, certain qualities and attributes of the emperor tend to become personified or regarded as permanent elements in the character of the ruler: it may be Clementia, or Indulgentia, or Munificentia, it may be the Greek Philanthropia or Euergesia. In this way they tend to acquire a special meaning, or rather a complex of special meanings. Two such words are Providentia and Aeternitas, and the object of the present study is to review some of the evidence (it would be difficult to collect all) and elucidate the significance which the word Providentia or the word Aeternitas might convey to a citizen of the Empire in the second century.*

1. PROVIDENTIA

Arrian, in the third book of his Discourses of Epictetus (Schenkl), chapter xv, section 14, recounts a retort made by the philosopher Musonius Rufus to a query by some unknown scoffer: in O. Hense's edition of Musonius (Leipzig, 1905) this retort appears as fragment xlvii. The text runs as follows:—

‘Ρούφω τις ἔλεγεν Γάλβα σφαγέντος ὅτι ἔνυν προνοία ὁ κόσμος διοικεῖται’; ὁ δὲ ‘μὴ παρέργως ποτ’ ’ ἔφη ‘ἀπὸ Γάλβα κατεσκεύασα, ὅτι προνοία ὁ κόσμος διοικεῖται;’¹

The text is not certain: both Coraes and Kronenberg propose alterations; *παρέργως* is used here, as in Aristotle, to mean ‘carelessly’ or ‘superficially’; cf. Ath. Pol. 28, 5. *δοκεῖ μέντοι τοῖς μὴ παρέργως ἀποφαινομένοις* . . .

* I wish to express my thanks to Miss J. M. C. Toynbee, Mr. H. Mattingly, and Mr. C. T. Seltman for their kind assistance.

¹ This fragment of Musonius is given in Schenkl's 2nd edition of Epictetus, III, xv, 14, and will be found as fragment 43 in O. Hense's edition of Musonius, Leipzig, 1905.

Bearing this in mind, the sentences may be paraphrased into English as follows:—

After Galba's murder a man said to Musonius, 'Well, is the world governed by Providence *now*?' But he replied, 'Surely I never deduced superfluously from Galba that the world is governed by Providence.'

Retorts such as these from nineteen centuries ago may have lost something of their flavor, but the general meaning is plain enough. That the world was governed by Providence was a cardinal dogma of the Stoics, and as a result some awkward questions had to be answered. 'Quaesisti a me, Lucili,' writes Seneca in the first of his dialogues, 'quid ita, si providentia mundus regeretur, multa bonis viris mala acciderent.'² Doubtless many Romans had rashly seen a proof of Providence's working in the accession of Galba; after Nero's tyranny and the risings it had caused, Galba—elderly, sober, and serious—seemed to promise a change for the better; under his rule (as the legends on his coinage show) men were to look forward to a time when the armies would be loyal, the provinces in concord, and the safety of mankind assured.³ Men could believe in Providence again: Galba's death shattered that belief, and the question put to Musonius would be one that many were asking.

Such would be the general interpretation. But I suspect that there may have been in the gibe about *Pronoia* a more particular significance at this date, for *Providentia* had a Roman as well as a Stoic significance. In the late Republic PROVIDENTIA was that foresight which, whether manifested by the gods, or by men working as the intermediaries of the gods, helped to secure the continued and peaceful existence of the state, preserving it against external or internal dangers. To quote one example only: after the unveiling of the Catilinarian conspiracy the Senate passed a vote of thanks to Cicero, as he himself records (in Catil. III, 14), 'quod virtute consilio providentia mea res publica maximis periculis sit liberata.'⁴ But

² Seneca, dial. I (de Providentia), 1. For *providentia* as a translation of *pronoia* see Cicero, de nat. deor. I, 18 (he also sometimes uses *prudentia*).

³ For a treatment, based upon the coin-evidence, of this topic, see O. Th. Schultz, Die Rechtstitel und Regierungsprogramme auf römischen Kaisermünzen, 21-27.

⁴ Cicero laid some emphasis upon the divine inspiration of his own *providentia*.

though Providentia may have been at work then, she was singularly lacking for the next three decades.

With the establishment of Augustus as Princeps a wave of gratitude and relief swept over a war-weary world. Poets and prose writers gave full expression to it, recognising the hand of the gods in giving the world such a deliverer and ruler. Augustus himself was most careful to encourage this feeling that he was a man sent by Providence: anyone who reads the famous 94th chapter of Suetonius' *Divus Augustus* and the erudite commentary of M. Deonna upon it,⁵ will see what a host of omens, divine signs, and wonders heralded and accompanied the course of this heaven-sent man upon earth; the very title Augustus helped. This is the sentiment which we find in a notable decree of all the cities of Asia: they wanted a day to start their New Year, and after consulting the proconsul Paullus Fabius Maximus they came to the conclusion that no day could be better than the birthday of Augustus. So their decree begins:⁶

ἐπειδὴ ἡ θεῖως διατάξασα τὸν βίον ἡμῶν πρόνοια, σπουδὴν εἰσενενκαμένη καὶ φιλοτιμίαν, τὸ τεληότατον τῷ βίῳ διεκόσμησεν ἀγαθὸν ἐνενκαμένη τὸν Σεβαστόν, ὃν εἰς εὐεργεσίαν ἀνθρώπων ἐπλήρωσεν ἀρετῆς . . . κτλ.

Divine Providence had produced Augustus! There was certainly some justification for this feeling: the rulers of Asia — whether Greek, barbarian, or Roman — during the past hundred years, had hardly been providential and had done little for their subjects. But besides the stress laid upon the providential sending of Augustus as peacebringer and ruler we can observe an emphasis upon the constant care and the almost

Quintilian, when warning against the evil of praising oneself, remarks (XI, i, 25) 'et M. Tullius saepe dicit de oppressa coniuratione Catilinae: sed modo id virtuti Senatus, modo providentiae deorum immortalium assignat'; we shall meet the *providentia deorum* again later. See also ad Atticum, I, xvi, 6 and Plutarch, Cicero, 31.

⁵ W. Deonna, La légende d'Octave Auguste Dieu Sauveur et maître du monde, *Rev. Hist. Relig.* LXXXIII, 1921, 32, 163; LXXXIV, 1921, 77.

⁶ The older form of the text is in *Orientis Graeci Inscr. Selectae*, II, 458; a revised and improved form by W. H. Buckler will be found in *Suppl. Epig. Graecum*, IV, 490. For a similar sense of gratitude (though there is no mention of *providentia*) see the Latin inscription from Narbo, Dessau, ILS, 112.

paternal solicitude that Augustus showed for the welfare of his subjects, — what Suetonius can call later the ‘*principis sollicitudo*’: the province of Baetica records its thanks to Augustus ‘*quod beneficio et perpetua eius cura provincia pacata est*,’ and in the now famous Cyrene edicts Augustus himself declares ‘[from this] it will be plain to all who inhabit the provinces how much care I and the Senate take that none of our subjects should suffer wrong or extortion.’⁷ So it is that after the reign of Augustus we find *Providentia* (or *Pronoia*) appearing more frequently and in many forms, being not so much the Divine Providence as its earthly counterpart, the foresight of the Princeps, the *providentia Augusti* (or *Augusta*); we can roughly define the task of this foresight as being ‘to care for the life of the state,’ and so it manifests itself chiefly in three ways, by caring for the welfare of the people, by providing for a stable succession, and by warding off conspiracies. To anticipate somewhat, we may say that the *providentia* of the emperor provides for the *aeternitas* of Rome.

Augustus and his governors certainly lost no opportunity of declaring his paternal care for citizens and subjects alike, but what of the succession? Velleius Paterculus, in a passage (II, 103) to which we shall return later, declares that in A.D. 4, when Augustus solemnly adopted Tiberius as his son, men began to entertain a hope ‘*perpetuae securitatis aeternitatisque Romani imperii*.’ Velleius was writing before A.D. 30, and we can observe during the early part of the reign of Tiberius an emphasis upon both AETERNITAS and PROVIDENTIA, always in connection with Augustus. At Rome a coin figures DIVVS AVGVSTVS and on the reverse the legend PROVIDENT. (with type Altar), while Emerita struck coins showing the dead emperor and bearing the legend AETERNITAS AVGVSTA.⁸ Some part of the feeling attaching to these legends

⁷ Baetica, Dessau, ILS, 103: the Cyrene edict conveniently in H. Malcovati, *Caesaris Augusti . . . Fragmenta*, 43, no. CII.

⁸ Mattingly-Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, vol. I, 95 ff. For the Emerita coin see A. Vives y Escudero, *La Moneda Hispanica*, IV, 66, no. 59; coins from Italica, in Spain, bear the legend PROVIDENTIAE AVGVSTI, op. cit., 127, no. 9. In A. Heiss, *Description générale des monn. ant. de l’Espagne*, the Emerita coin is nos. 28 and 29, p. 401; the Italica one, no. 8, p. 380.

must have been gratitude to the foresight of Augustus (or was it divine foresight?), who had provided for the continued existence of the state by adopting as heir Tiberius, and also making Tiberius himself adopt an heir, so that the succession should be certain and with no risk of civil war.⁹

Shortly after 30 a different manifestation of the ruler's *providentia*, this time as guardian of the *Salus Publica*, took place. The safety of the state was endangered by Sejanus; Tiberius discovered and crushed his conspiracy. Here there are some interesting pieces of evidence: Valerius Maximus indulges in an outburst of malediction against the traitor and his infernal plans, but then exclaims — ‘sed vigilarunt oculi deorum, sidera vigorem suum obtinuerunt,’¹⁰ et in primis auctor et tutela nostrae incolumitatis, ne excellentissima merita sua totius orbis ruina collaberentur, divino consilio providit. Itaque stat pax, valent leges, sincerus privati ac publici officii tenor servatur’ (IX, xi, Ext. 4); in his Preface he refers to and exalts the ‘*caelestis providentia*’ of Tiberius. Equally significant are inscriptions: the loyal population of Interamna made a dedication, in commemoration of the event, to *Salus perpetua Augusta* and to *Libertas publica populi Romani*, and also ‘*Providentiae Ti. Caesaris Augusti nati ad aeternitatem Romani nominis, sublato hoste perniciosissimo p. R.*’¹¹ Here, as Valerius Maximus, the people of Interamna note and glorify the ‘foresight’ of Tiberius; to its conjunction with *aeternitas* I shall return later. In Crete a similar dedication was made by the governor, P. Viriasius Naso, — ‘*numini ac providentiae Ti. Caesaris Augusti et senatus, [in memoriam] eius die qui fuit xv k. Novembr.*,’¹² but as Naso was the governor of a Senatorial province the

⁹ This adoption, in fact, was one of the best pieces of foresight of this ‘circumspectissimus et prudentissimus princeps.’ But that an Ara Providentiae Augustae already existed in Rome (as R. Peter seems to assert in his article upon *Providentia* in Roscher’s Lexikon) appears to me very doubtful. The Italica coin (supra) with its legend *Providentiae Augusti* around a pictured altar suggests that there was such an altar in that town, but not necessarily in Rome. It is mentioned in the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* (Henzen), p. xlv, for the reign of Gaius, which gives a terminus; I prefer, as will be seen, a date in 31 or 32.

¹⁰ This phrase about the stars must be in compliment to Tiberius’ known love of and knowledge of astrology.

¹¹ Dessau, ILS, 157.

¹² Dessau, ILS, 158.

Senate too has its share of divine foresight as much as the Princes.

On the evidence afforded by Valerius Maximus and these two inscriptions we can safely deduce that loyalists and flatterers would celebrate the *providentia* of Tiberius, especially as displayed in saving the state from the conspiracy of Sejanus. Near the church of St. John in Corinth was discovered a dedication 'pro salute Ti. Caesaris Augusti,' and not far from it an inscription which shows that there existed (before A.D. 70) a 'sacerdos in perpetuum Providentiae Augustae et Salutis Publicae.'¹³ On this we must agree with Professor West's hypothesis, that the first dedication was to commemorate the escape of Tiberius from Sejanus, and that shortly afterwards the loyal colony established an altar of *Providentia Augusta* and *Salus Publica*. And the bulk of the evidence so far would lead us to date the Ara Providentiae Augustae in Rome itself not to Augustus' time, but to the years immediately succeeding A.D. 31, when Providentia Augusta had so signally manifested itself by saving the divine house of the Caesars (*divina domus*) from destruction.¹⁴

It would not be unreasonable to conclude that in the last years of his reign Tiberius was celebrated for his *providentia*, as exemplified especially in the detecting of dangers; but his care for the provinces, too, was not less famous.¹⁵ The evidence

¹³ For these two Corinth inscriptions see A. B. West, *Corinth*, vol. VIII, part ii, 1931, nos. 15 and 110.

¹⁴ There is yet another dedication to *Providentia Augusta* at Interamna, though undated, Dessau, ILS, 3793. There can be no doubt that the overthrow of Sejanus by the 'foresight' of Tiberius made a great impression on the provinces. For that reason I am inclined to date the well-known inscription from Naix (CIL, XIII, 4635), 'Tib. Caesari Aug. fil. Augusto et pro perpetua salute divinae domus,' after the punishment of Sejanus, for the divinity of the 'divina domus' was thereby triumphantly vindicated. For the growing prestige of the domus Augusta see J. Gagé, *Divus Augustus*, *Rev. Arch.*, 34, 1931, 11. We may note that the phrase 'divina domus' occurs in late Tiberian times and after: so Phaedrus, V, vii, 38 — 'superbiens honore divinae domus' — and compare the language of decrees at Cyzicus (IGRR, IV, 144) and of Tlos (IGRR, III, 547), in which we encounter such phrases as αἰώνιος οἶκος and οἶκος ἀφθαρτος καὶ ἀθάνατος. For some interesting remarks on the origin of the phrase *Divina Domus*, see D. M. Pippidi, *Dominus Noster Caesar*, A propos du texte de Scribonius Largus, in *Atheneum* I, 1935, 637 (esp. 643-653).

¹⁵ For Tiberius' administration of the provinces see F. B. Marsh, *The Reign of Tiberius*, 134-159.

is well known, but I prefer to take two less familiar passages. Plutarch, in his *De exilio*, chapter 9, reminds us that even on Capreae 'the cares of empire' (αἱ τῆς ἡγεμονίας φροντίδες) kept buffeting in upon Tiberius; while Josephus has a curious paragraph to illustrate the care that Tiberius had for the provincials, confirming it by a cynical parable from the emperor himself. The Greek phrase that Josephus uses, αἰδοῦς προμηθεία τῶν ὑποτελῶν, is not an easy one to translate, but the word προμηθεία must imply something like *providentia* or *sollicitudo*.¹⁶

As years go on the *providentia* inherent in the Princeps begins to be taken for granted. A governor under Claudius can assure the citizens of Ephesus that the emperor 'has taken the whole human race under his protection,' and the so-called *Senatus Consultum de aedificiis non diruendis* (passed somewhere about A.D. 44-46) opens: — 'cum providentia optumi principis tectis quoque urbis nostrae et totius aeternitati Italiae prospexerit. . . .' ¹⁷ Here again, it may be noted, we get the same association of *providentia* with *aeternitas* as was observed in the words of Velleius and the Interamna dedication to Tiberius. The *providentia* of the Princeps looks to the *aeternitas* of the Roman people, whether by measures of law, or by providing a proper succession, or by saving it from the horrors of conspiracy. This last aspect becomes prominent under Nero, because there were so many more conspiracies (or alleged ones) discovered. In the spring of 55 Nero had his mother Agrippina put to death, alleging that she had conspired against him; among the many thanksgivings that took place the Arval Brethren sacrificed, on the 13th of April, 'ob supplicationes indictas pro salute Neronis Claudii Caesaris'; Jupiter, Juno, and

¹⁶ Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* XVIII, 172. This passage is one of those concerned with events at Rome which show considerable stylistic peculiarities and difficulties, where it is possible that Josephus is drawing directly upon a Latin original and translating the terms as best he can; see M. P. Charlesworth in *Camb. Hist. Journal*, 1933, IV, 105. J. Enoch Powell has suggested that the whole passage should read τὰς δ' ἀρχὰς συγχωρεῖν τοῖς ἀπαξ εἰς αὐτὰς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καταστᾶσιν αἰδίου, προμηθεία τῶν ὑποτελῶν, which would be a great improvement; see his note in *Class. Rev.* L, 1936, 11.

¹⁷ For this pronouncement see *Suppl. Epig. Graecum*, IV, 516; for the so-called SC de aedificiis non diruendis see Dessau, *ILS*, 6043. The early Alexandrian coins of Nero (J. Vogt, *Die alexandrinischen Kaisermünzen*, pp. 28-29) proclaim 'the foresight of the new Augustus,' πρόνοια νέου Σεβαστοῦ.

Minerva received their victims, but so too did *Salus Publica* and so too did *Providentia*.¹⁸ Eleven years later the *Acta* of the Arval Brethren record sacrifices ‘ob detecta nefaria consilia’ (possibly the so-called Vinician conspiracy), and here too offerings were made to *Providentia* and to *Aeternitas imperii*.¹⁹ Yet the paternal side of imperial foresight was not forgotten: Tiberius Julius Alexander, in his famous edict to Egypt, promises (on some points) to write to the emperor, οὐ καὶ περὶ τῆς πάντων ἡμῶν σωτηρίας ἡ διηγεκῆς εὐεργεσία καὶ πρόνοιά ἐστιν.²⁰ Whether he was thinking of Nero or of Galba (as Wilcken suggested), foresight is a definite imperial attribute.

Now, however, another aspect of *Providentia* begins to be stressed. Nero committed suicide in 68, and left no heir, and the ‘divine house’ collapsed. There was no one person who could gather round him the immense loyalty and prestige attaching to the House of Augustus, and there were various claimants to the throne. The first successful one, Galba, was an old man and childless; should he die where would the state be? Could he but designate a suitable successor, and so provide a focus for loyal feeling, he might stabilize government once more and avoid the risk of the dreaded civil war. This was the topic of discussion by all in Rome and the provinces; young Titus, on his way from Vespasian to pay his respects to Galba, was at once rumoured to be the prospective heir.²¹ *Providentia* might do a great work by making Galba choose and adopt the right man. Galba himself pondered the problem long, and the news from Germany, at the beginning of the year 69, at last moved him to act, and to choose an heir; on January 10 he solemnly adopted L. Calpurnius Piso Licinianus. Under that day in the *Acta* of the Arval Brethren appears the notice: ‘adoptio facta L. Li[ciniani] . . .’ and victims were sacrificed to *Securitas* and to *Providentia*.²² Foresight seemed to have banished fear and restored security: ‘provisum adoptione

¹⁸ Henzen, *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*, lxxiv.

¹⁹ Henzen, l.c., lxxxi.

²⁰ Dittenberger, *OGIS*, 669; see U. Wilcken in *Zeits. d. Sav.-Stift*, XLII, 1921, 144 ff., and cf. O. Reinmuth in *Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.*, LXV, 1934.

²¹ Tacitus, *Histories*, I, 12 and II, 1.

²² Henzen, l.c., xc. A coin figuring Galba, with the legend PROVIDENT. S. C., must (Mr. H. Mattingly kindly informs me) be seriously considered for posthumous issue (*Mattingly-Sydenham*, I, 216, no. 164).

videbatur,' Tacitus makes Piso say, 'ut ne post Galbam quidem bello locus esset.' ²³

It was a vain hope. But bearing these events in mind we can see that in the question put to Musonius there may have been a reference to another sort of *Providentia* than the Stoic; during the days between the 10th and 15th of January the air must have been full of blessings and hopes based upon the *providentia* the emperor had shown by his adoption, and the word must have been constantly on men's lips. It is, at any rate, worth observing what the later emperors all did, and that was to try and make their position firmer by nominating as successor either a son or an adopted son. Thus Otho had thought of adopting his nephew, Salvius Cocceianus, but had deferred the act of adoption until success was won, ὅπως συνάρχοντες κρατήσαντος αὐτοῦ, μὴ προσαπόλοιτο παύσαντος.²⁴ Vitellius, once the news of his victory and of Otho's suicide reached him, immediately sent for his infant son from Rome, 'perlatumque et paludamento opertum sinu retinens Germanicum appellavit cinxitque cunctis fortunae principalis insignibus,' and issued coins with the legend LIBERI IMP. GERM. AUG.²⁵ The final victor, Vespasian, showed from the outset by his actions what he is said to have declared in a speech, — 'My sons shall succeed me or no one.' By proclaiming both his sons Principes Juventutis, by associating Titus with himself in power, and by giving both Titus and Domitian frequent consulships, he made it manifest to the world that there was an established succession, and that too a succession of men of experience in government. Such was his foresight, and that explains the remarkably large number of PROVIDENTIA issues in his coinage. Amongst the earliest issues of Titus, once he had become emperor and so succeeded to the place that his father had designed for him, is a PROVIDENTIA type, on which he is depicted as receiving from his deified father the globe that signifies power.²⁶

²³ Tacitus, Histories, I, 29.

²⁴ Plutarch, Otho, 16.

²⁵ Tacitus, Histories, II, 59; H. Mattingly, Coins of the Rom. Emp. in the Brit. Mus., I, 1923, Table 61, 4-6. Perhaps we may also refer to this event a PROVIDENT. S. C. coin of Vitellius, Mattingly-Sydenham, I, 228, no. 24. As being a possible danger the boy was afterwards put to death by order of Mucianus, Tacitus, Histories, IV, 80.

²⁶ For the frequency of the PROVIDENTIA issues under Vespasian see Mattingly-

Nerva's reign presents us with a variation on this type. A coin which shows Nerva holding the globe of power and facing a Senator bears the legend PROVIDENTIA SENATUS. This may signify diarchy, but it may equally signify the foresight the Senate showed in approving of Nerva as Princeps.²⁷ With the advent of Trajan *Providentia*, as we might expect, becomes more prominent. First there is the Divine Providence which had inspired Nerva to adopt him and so raised him up to be ruler: the gods had so planned and 'it was their great and secret design which Nerva had made actual.' We may observe a significant variation in the phrasing, — 'iam te providentia deorum primum in locum provexerat,' says Pliny,²⁸ — and it is a significance that will need discussion later. But as well as the Divine Providence, there was the human foresight and care of the Optimus Princeps towards his subjects: the state adoption and development of the system of *alimenta*, whereby the poorer people were looked after, is acknowledged at Tarracina by an altar dedicated 'Providentiae imp. Caesaris Nervae Trajani Augusti Germanici ex s.c.,' and greeted at Rome as a measure 'qua aeternitati Italiae suae prospexerit'; the new harbour constructed at Ancona to give safety to shipping is commemorated by an arch dedicated to the 'providentissimus princeps' by Senate and People.²⁹ These are public documents: in his private correspondence Pliny can speak of the 'fossa, quam providentissimus imperator fecit,' while in his letters to Trajan the thought of his foresight constantly recurs: — 'pecuniae publicae, domine, providentia tua et ministerio nostro et iam exactae sunt et exiguntur,' 'tu quidem, domine, providentissime

Sydenham, II, 74, 79, 87, 91, 95, 97, 98, 102, 104, 105, and 107. The coin showing Titus receiving the globe from Vespasian is on p. 128: on the globus as symbol of power see A. Alföldi in Mitt. Deutsch. Arch. Inst. (Röm. Abt.) L. 1935, 117 f. There is a reference to the *Pronoia* of Vespasian in Dio Cassius, LXVI, 11, τό τε σύμπαν τῇ μὲν προνοίᾳ τῶν κοινῶν αὐτοκράτωρ ἐνομιζέτο, ἐς δὲ δὴ τὰλλα πάντα κοινὸς καὶ ἰσοδαιτὸς σφίσις ἦν, but this may be Zonaras and too late to use as evidence.

²⁷ Mattingly-Sydenham, II, 229; for the *providentia* of the Senate cf. the Tiberian example, Dessau, ILS, 159.

²⁸ Pliny, Paneg. 10, 4 (ed. M. Schuster, 1933).

²⁹ Dessau, ILS, 282 (Tarracina) and 6106 (Rome); the Ancona arch, 298. But R. Paribeni, Optimus Princeps, II, 116, is inclined to refer the Tarracina inscription possibly to road-making or other public works.

vereris, ne commissus flumini atque ita mari lacus effluat,' 'providentissime, domine, fecisti, quod praecepisti Calpurnio Macro, ut legionarium centurionem Byzantium mitteret,' 'existimo tamen tua providentia constituendum aliquid et sancierendum per quod utilitatibus eorum in perpetuum consulatur,'³⁰ — all these show how *providentia* has become the natural attribute of a good emperor, and how it begins its course towards a court-title.

Better still, we can see how the conception of a ruler as caring for and providing for his subjects is skilfully propagated. Dio Chrysostom was the friend and admirer of Trajan and his utterances 'On Kingship' are something of an embodiment of the official creed. Observe how, in the Third Oration, everywhere stress is laid on foresight as a duty of the ruler, on the duty of the stronger to care for the weaker — λέγεται γὰρ ἡ μὲν ἀρχή (contrasted with τυραννίς) νόμιμος ἀνθρώπων διοίκησις καὶ πρόνοια ἀνθρώπων κατὰ νόμον: nature herself has shown τὴν κατὰ φύσιν τοῦ κρείττονος τῶν ἐλαττόνων ἀρχὴν καὶ πρόνοιαν, and everywhere τὸ βέλτιον τοῦ ἥττονος ἔταξεν ὁ θεὸς προνοεῖν τε καὶ ἄρχειν: the good ruler is θεοφιλής, ἡγεῖται δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις συμφέρειν τὴν αὐτοῦ πρόνοιαν οὕτως ὡς αὐτῷ τὴν ἐκείνων ἀρχήν.³¹ Many other instances could be cited, but there is no need; sometimes differing aspects of the ruler's πρόνοια are mentioned, his εὐεργεσία or his φιλανθρωπία, but throughout the close connection between ἀρχή and πρόνοια is stressed, and that πρόνοια is interpreted as care for the ruled.

But another aspect of *Providentia* — succession — is not neglected. On coins of 98/99 a *Providentia* type appears which shows Trajan receiving the globe from Nerva, symbolizing his adoption. Some twenty years later, when the *vota vicennalia* draw near, the coins once more lay stress on the Pro(videntia) Aug(usta), and Mr. Mattingly suggests that Trajan had a double purpose therein, — to send men's thoughts back to the day when Nerva's foresight secured the succession for him, and to arouse interest in the problem as to whom Trajan would

³⁰ The five quotations come from Pliny's Letters (ed. M. Schuster): VIII, 17, 2; X, 54, 61, 77, 108.

³¹ The four quotations come from the Third Oration on Kingship in von Arnim's edition of Dio; the passages are 43, 50, 62, and 52; cf. also 107-108 and 127.

designate as *his* successor.³² The circumstances of Hadrian's adoption were doubtful enough: as though to combat suspicion Hadrian issued coins with the legend *ADOPTIO*, depicting Trajan and himself with clasped hands, and also with the legend *PROVIDENTIA DEORUM*, where Hadrian is shown looking left towards an eagle flying right, and raising his right hand to receive a sceptre from it. There can be no doubt as to the meaning: the eagle of Jupiter is bestowing the sceptre on the divinely-appointed successor Hadrian.³³ But why *Providentia Deorum*, when *Providentia Augusta* would to all seeming have done just as well?

The answer I would suggest here (to be elaborated later) is that the phrase *Providentia Deorum* not only corresponds to a definite change of sentiment, but also gives a ruler a better claim to power as the chosen of the gods; certainly it tends to dominate the stage during the second century. The type *Providentia* does appear, it is true, during the later years of Hadrian, when it probably refers to the adoption of Antoninus, and it is echoed by an unique Alexandrian type of *Pronoia*, with the picture of a Phoenix (rightly interpreted by Vogt as symbolizing the adoption of Antoninus), — but apart from these instances it does not appear again signifying the succession till 196.³⁴ But the *providentia* of the emperor, the paternal care of his subjects, is never lost to sight. A coin of Hadrian, with legend *PROVIDENTIA AVGVSTI*, depicts a woman holding ploughshare and rake, and presumably attests the emperor's interest in agriculture; Avidius Quietus assures the people of Asia that a dispute about some sacred territory that had lasted many years 'has now been ended thanks to the providence of the greatest of emperors.'³⁵ Fronto lists the

³² Mattingly-Sydenham, II, 246; for the later issues see 269 and 271.

³³ *Ib.*, 339 (*Adoptio*) and 415 and 418 (*Providentiae Deorum*).

³⁴ Instances of *Providentia Deorum* on coins are frequent during the second century: the Arval Acta mention vows to *Providentia Deorum* 'pro salute imperatoris' in 183, Henzen, p. clxxxviii (? for the detection of a conspiracy). For coins referring to the adoption of Antoninus see Mattingly-Sydenham, II, 370, 339, and 444. For the Alexandrian *Pronoia* coin of A.D. 137/138 see J. Vogt, l.c., 109 ff. Vogt also refers the type *Pronoia Sebaste* of 196/197 to the designation of Caracallus as Caesar.

³⁵ The coin, Mattingly-Sydenham, II, 429; Avidius Quietus' edict, Dittenberger, OGIS, 502.

providentia of Antoninus Pius in a formidable catalogue of his virtues, and Marcus Aurelius gratefully records that he learnt from his father τὸ πόρρωθεν προνοητικόν, καὶ τῶν ἐλαχίστων προδιοικητικὸν ἀτραγῶδως.³⁶ And it is in the reign of Antoninus that we find another expression of the imperial creed, also from a Greek; Aristeides, in his speech εἰς βασιλέα, c. 14, asks ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ τὰ πάντα διοικοῦσα Πρόνοια καὶ διατάττουσα καὶ τοῦτον ἐκάθισεν εἰς τὸν βασιλῆιον θρόνον τὸν δικαίωτατον καὶ ὀσιώτατον βασιλέων, τί ἂν τις πρῶτον καὶ μέγιστον εἰπῇν ἔχοι ὧν τῆς ἀγαθῆς αὐτοῦ τυχεῖς καὶ προνοίας ἀπολαύομεν; the earthly ruler, he states, must resemble the heavenly one κατὰ τε τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ τὴν πρόνοιαν ἀπάντων τῶν ἀρχομένων. In his speech εἰς Ῥώμην, c. 36, he praises Rome because, among other things, she sends out governors ἐπὶ προστασίᾳ καὶ προνοίᾳ τῶν ἀρχομένων καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ δεσπότῃ εἶναι.³⁷

It may be objected that these utterances of Dio Chrysostom and of Aristeides are simply commonplaces. Certainly there is little original in either of them, and centuries before Plato had been daring enough to suggest that the duty of rulers is to look after and care for the ruled. Yet that duty had often been forgotten; it was no small thing that Augustus should have recalled it to life and action, and it is significant that two writers in the second century should lay down so emphatically and clearly that *pronoia* is one of the chief attributes of the good ruler. The idea had developed steadily, so that by now various actions of the emperor could be greeted as manifestations of his *providentia*. There is no need to multiply examples, but a few may be given at random. When Marcus and Commodus propose to cut down the expenses of gladiatorial games their *providentia* is praised; it is to the *divina providentia* of Commodus that the oppressed coloni of the Saltus Burunitanus appeal; in the reign of Alexander Severus a coin depicts *Providentia Augusta* with the attributes of Annona; the *providentia* of

³⁶ Fronto, ed. Naber, 224; Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, I, 16, 2.

³⁷ At this point I have departed from my rule of strict chronological order, for though the two speeches will be found in B. Keil's text of Aristeides (Vol. II, Berlin, 1898), the first (εἰς βασιλέα) is certainly not by Aristeides. It is post-Antonine and probably of early third-century date; on the whole question see A. Boulanger, Aelius Aristide, Paris, 1923, 382-4 (and the articles and discussions there cited).

Gordian is praised because he restored a road 'diutina incuria prorsus corruptam,' and it is to that same *pronoia* that the men of Scaptopara, distressed and ill-treated, apply for pity and protection.³⁸

This is the beneficent side of the ruler's foresight; once only do we get a return of *providentia* in detecting conspiracies, and the sinister occasion can easily be guessed: it is under the dynasty of the Severi, — 'quod evidenti in [lustrique provi]dencia domini n[ostri Severus et] Antoninus Pii Au[gusti et Geta Caesar] cum [Julia Aug. ubivis spes] . . . parricidiales insid[iatorum sustulerunt].' ³⁹ Into the tangled history of the third century I cannot enter: a short note upon the *Providentia* legends of the coinage will be found in the article by A. D. Nock, *A diis electa*, in this review, XXIII, 1930, 266–268, but one point is worthy of notice. After all the horrors of barbarian invasions and civil wars and rival pretenders there comes the great restoration of Diocletian: his coins bear the legend PROVID DEORVM QVIES AVGG and show personifications of *Tranquillitas* and *Providentia* facing each other; equally significant, inscriptions and dedications once more celebrate the *providentia* of the emperor; 'providentissimo principi, rectori orbis et domino, fundatori pacis aeternae Diocletiano,' or in a dedication to the emperors, 'quorum virtute et providentia omnia in melius reformantur.' ⁴⁰ These are the things for which the weary citizens were hoping and praying, for lasting peace and for a change for the better to be brought about by the *providentia* of their rulers, who care for their subjects.

If we look back and try to sum up the results of this tentative enquiry we find a fairly consistent idea running throughout the centuries of the work of *Providentia*. The Divine Providence that late Republicans had regarded as looking after

³⁸ The *providentia* of Marcus and Commodus, Bruns, *Fontes Iuris Romani*, ed. 7, no. 63, line 12; of Commodus, *ib.*, no. 86, Col. 3, line 1; *Providentia* with *Annona* attributes, Cohen, *Description historique*. . . Severus Alexander, nos. 499 ff. (I owe the reference to Mr. Mattingly); of Gordian, Dessau, ILS, 5876 and Dittenberger, *Sylloge*³, no. 888.

³⁹ Dessau, ILS, 430 (the restorations are Mommsen's).

⁴⁰ For the coin references see the article by Nock cited in the text; the two inscriptions quoted here are Dessau, ILS, 618 and 637.

Rome, finally, after years of civil war, sent Augustus as deliverer, and this was acknowledged by citizens and provincials alike. But as the years went on in undisturbed peace, the *providentia* that both Augustus and his successors showed caused the word to become associated more and more with the imperial house, until *providentia* was regarded as a normal attribute of the emperor, and was in fact *providentia Augusta*. To the men of the early second century, breathing again after the murder of Domitian and hailing restored 'Liberty,' it seemed perhaps too much linked to the dynastic idea, too little to divine governance. That is why *Providentia Deorum*, which reappears in the Panegyric of Pliny the Younger, is an expression of a difference genuinely felt. The happy times had come again, as Nerva testified himself. The wrath of the gods was appeased, 'tandem exorata numina,' and they had blessed Rome by inspiring Nerva to choose Trajan,⁴¹ and would continue — as the pious might hope — to bless Rome by bestowing wise rulers. No longer was it to be a mere man's choice, the will of an Augustus anxious to found a dynasty, but the loving care of the gods of Rome themselves who were protecting their state. In addition the phrase had the great advantage, for an emperor, that it represented him as the divinely-appointed successor and so gave him something of a divine right; we may note that on coins *Providentia Deorum* seems to be employed especially when the question of succession is prominent, or of accession, or of some great deliverance. But apart from these occasions the *providentia* of the emperor is always prominent, always ready to be exercised for the benefit of his subjects. It is that 'infatigabilis cura' of Hadrian, 'per quam adsidue pro humanis utilitatibus excubat'; it is that attribute which made the consuls demand of Trajan, over some abuse, 'sicut aliis vitiis huic quoque providentia sua occurreret.'⁴² This human *providentia* has, as we have seen, various aspects, but they can

⁴¹ On this topic see M. P. Charlesworth in this journal, XXVIII, 1935, 41.

⁴² The *providentia* of Hadrian; Bruns, *Fontes*⁷, no. 115; of Trajan, Pliny, Ep. VI, 19, 3; for Hadrian as the ruler who aimed at the happiness of his subjects see Pausanias, I, v, 5. It may be noted that in the third century Origen replies to Celsus' claim that men must look for everything to the emperor, since to him has been given all upon earth, by saying, 'No, what we get, we get from God and from His *pronoia*' (Origen, contra Celsum, VIII, 67).

all be conveniently summed up in one formula — ‘the *providentia* of the Princeps aims at the *aeternitas* of the Roman people.’ This it may do by choosing an heir, by guarding against conspiracies (and so bringing *securitas*), or by paternal legislation and activity, whether relating to buildings, harbour-works, roads, expenditure, corn-supply, agriculture, the care of the young citizens (*alimenta*), or the helping of the oppressed. All these are aspects of the ruler’s kindly care for his people, all manifestations of his foresight. It is no ignoble ideal, and it was to have a long life; here we have sketched simply some of its beginnings.

2. AETERNITAS

In the first section I suggested as a tentative hypothesis that *Providentia*, whether of the gods or of the emperor, aims at securing the *aeternitas* of the Roman people and state. It is worth considering a little further some of the meanings of this word during the first two centuries of the Principate; it would be a hard task to give all the associations connected with it, but we may illustrate some of the significances and of the shifts of meaning.

In ancient times every member of a community liked to be assured of the lastingness of the whole of which he was a part; it is a deep-seated and natural longing. The dreary series of civil wars of Rome, from 49 to 31 B.C., had shaken terribly the assurance of her citizens; they felt themselves an accursed generation. Then came Augustus and peace: confidence in the state and in themselves slowly returned, and this feeling tended to fasten around certain institutions and symbols, — again naturally enough, — certain sacred sites or customs of the great city. Horace’s idea of lastingness is

dum Capitolium
scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex, —

that is, the temple of Capitoline Jupiter, the very centre of Roman religious life, the Vestal who tended the undying fire and guarded the Palladium (‘quasi pignus nostrae salutis atque imperii’), and the Pontifex Maximus. Already, too, other

Augustan writers are beginning to think of the city of Rome as imperishable; to Tibullus it is 'urbs aeterna,' to Livy 'urbs invicta et aeterna.'

By the side of these there slowly grows up another symbol, for the establishment of the Principate meant that one man began to embody in himself much of the *maiestas* attaching to the Roman state, and so to become associated with the idea of eternity that clung about it, a tendency strengthened when in 12 B.C. Augustus was chosen as Pontifex Maximus, head of the state religion, guardian of the Vestal Virgins, and having in his own house an 'aedicula et ara' of Vesta. Here Ovid provides two convenient texts: —

March 6. Caesaris innumeris, quos maluit ille mereri,
accessit titulis pontificalis honor.
ignibus aeternis aeterni numina praesunt
Caesaris: *imperii pignora iuncta vides.*

April 30. Aufer, Vesta, diem: cognati Vesta recepta est
limine; sic iusti constituere patres.
Phoebus habet partem: Vestae pars altera cessit:
quod superest illis, tertius ille tenet.
State Palatinae laurus, praetextaque quercu
stet domus: aeternos tres habet una deos.

We can make allowances for poetic licence, for courtly flattery, but underneath the extravagance of the language the fact remains that henceforth Augustus is associated with the eternal goddess, Vesta, and with the Palladium that she guards, and so begins to share something of her *aeternitas*.¹

Some sixteen years later Augustus, in A.D. 4, by his forethought (p. 110) provided for the continuance of the dynasty and so for the stability of that 'optimus status' of which he hoped to be called the founder. Hence Velleius can claim (as we saw in the first section) that Tiberius' adoption gave men hope of the 'perpetua securitas aeternitasque imperii Romani,'

¹ Ovid, *Fasti*, III, 419 ff.; IV, 949 ff. For a full treatment of Vesta and the Palladium as guarantee of Roman power see now P. K. Gross, *Die Unterpfänder der römischen Herrschaft*, 1935, 69–96. A brilliant article by F. Cumont, *L'Eternité des empereurs romains*, *Rev. d'hist. et de litt. relig.* I, 1896, p. 435, shows the growth and progress of the notion especially in the third and fourth centuries. Here I merely add a little more of the early evidence.

and when Augustus had died and been consecrated as *DIVVS AVGVSTVS* the coins that were issued with the legend *AE-TERNITATI AVGVSTAE* carried a double message. They express clearly not only the eternity that belongs to *Divus Augustus* as to every other god, but (as I think) that his dynasty, the form of government that he founded, is also sure of permanence.

If Augustus had been linked, as *Pontifex Maximus*, with the worship of *Vesta*, so were many of the women of the imperial family. His widow, *Livia*, received the privilege of sitting among the *Vestal Virgins* whenever she attended the theatre, and this privilege *Gaius* bestowed upon his grandmother *Antonia* and upon his sisters, and *Claudius* granted to *Messallina*.² There is observable, too, another interesting link between the imperial family and *Vesta*, prominent on the birthdays of the princes of the family: against 24 May (the birthday of *Germanicus*), and 7 October (the birthday of *Drusus Caesar*), and 16 November (the birthday of *Tiberius*) there appears in the *Calendar of Cumae* the notice '*Supplicatio Vestae*.'³ The birthdays of the heirs of the *domus Augusta* were greeted with the *supplicatio* to *Vesta*, because on them and by them the *aeternitas* of the divine family was assured.

Thus the *domus Augusta* was becoming a guardian of the lastingness of the state, and when *Tiberius*, by his foresight, overthrew what appeared to be a great danger to the dynasty, the 'conspiracy' of *Sejanus*, he was hailed as a ruler '*natus ad aeternitatem Romani nominis*.' (We may note how in the third century a variation upon this occurs, '*bono reipublicae natus*.') The *aeternitas* of the dynasty and of the state is further strengthened, the house of Augustus is becoming a '*divina domus*,' an 'indestructible and everlasting house.' Naturally, too, as it is one man who safeguards the permanence of the Roman people,

² Tacitus, *Ann.* IV, 16; Dio LIX, 3, 4 and LX, 22, 2. *Claudius* ordered the *Vestals* to celebrate the cult of the dead *Livia*, Dio LX, 5, 2. *Livia* may have been connected, even in her lifetime, as wife of the *Pontifex Maximus*, with the *Vestals*; see O. L. Richmond in *Journ. Rom. Stud.* IV, 1914, 193 (esp. p. 209).

³ For the *Feriale Cumanum* see Dessau, *ILS*, 108. The connections between these birthdays and the cult of *Vesta* had already been noticed by W. Weber, *Unters. z. Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus*, 251, note 907.

Valerius Maximus, looking back into history, finds that it was the first king, Romulus, 'qui aeternum Romano imperio spiritum ingeneraverat.'⁴ The Princeps becomes more and more a guarantor of the eternity of Rome, and we have already seen how the Providentia of Claudius provided for the *aeternitas* of Rome and Italy (p. 113). It follows that a conspiracy against the Princeps is a threat to the *aeternitas* of the state, and so in the vows made by the Arval Brethren after a detected conspiracy (? the Vinician, in the year 66) a cow is to be sacrificed 'aeternitati imperii,' and Nero himself institutes games 'pro aeternitate imperii.'⁵

It is essential to bear these things in mind, the position of the Augustan house, the emperor as both safeguarding and symbolizing the permanence of the Roman state, if we are to understand the full horror of what happened in 68 and 69, and what people's feelings were. We know, comfortably, that Vespasian was to come and restore peace: the men of the time did not. Instead they saw 'the indestructible and everlasting house' suddenly cut off, the *maiestas* that hedged its members gone, and the permanence of the state endangered. In the struggle that followed it is worth observing how conspicuous the two great deities of Rome, Jupiter and Vesta, are on the coinage. The mutinous legions of the Rhine issued coins with the legend I. O. MAX. CAPITOLINVS and VESTA P. R. QVIRITIVM: Otho, too, pictured them on his coins. Vitellius struck for Rome coins with the legend IVPITER VICTOR, VESTA S. C. (showing a curious type of Vesta holding trophy and sceptre), and PONT. MAX. (with image of Vesta), and for Spanish use issued coins bearing the legends I. O. MAX. CAPITOLINVS and VESTA P. R. QVIRITIVM.⁶ One day let us hope that a numismatist and historian will give us a complete interpretation of these momentous months: for the moment we note that Jupiter and Vesta, the symbols of the lasting power of Rome, are the gods that all parties paraded; each contestant wishes to show that he stands for Rome and that

⁴ Valerius Maximus, V, 3, 1.

⁵ Acta Fratr. Arval. (Henzen), p. lxxxi; Suetonius, Nero, 11.

⁶ For these coins see H. Mattingly, Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, I, 1923, pp. cxcix, cxx, cxxii, cxxiv, cxxvii, and cxxix.

Rome's gods and eternity are supporting him. Yet in December 69 the 'urbs invicta et aeterna' itself was the scene of bloodshed and murder, and the temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitol went up in flames. The chief symbol of Rome's greatness was now a ruin (see Professor Fraenkel's fine remarks in 'Rome and Greek Culture,' pp. 23-34), and the rebellious Gauls took the burning as a sign that at last Rome's domination was at an end.

Thus the task that faced Vespasian was formidable, for in addition to the making good of material damage there was the problem of how to restore heart and confidence to the Roman people. That explains why some of his earliest coin-issues (the bronze of 69-70) bear, besides such legends as FORTVNA REDVX or PAX AVGVSTA, the momentous one AETERNITAS P(opuli) R(omani), wherein victory is shown presenting the fateful Palladium to Vespasian.⁷ Hence, too, the rebuilding of the Capitol was urgent, for it would be a mark of the regained strength of Rome. The inauguration took place on June 21 in the year 70: it is a famous historical crux whether Vespasian was present. Tacitus' account seems to make it certain he was not, but Suetonius' words imply that he was. True, the two versions can be reconciled, but it is also possible that it was so important that the emperor should have been present at the inauguration that a later generation readily believed he had been. Throughout the Vespasianic coins emphasize the resurgent power of Rome — ROMA VICTRIX, ROMA RESVRGENS, ROMA PERPETVA, — and the message of the coins is reechoed by a series of dedications, to the *Victoria* of Vespasian, to the *Pax Augusta*, best of all to the 'Pax aeterna domus imperatoris Vespasiani Caesaris Augusti liberorumque eius.'⁸ Finally, the ideas of Peace, Victory, and the possession of heirs for the dynasty are summed up in the coinage of 75 and later, when aurei bear the triumphant legend AETERNITAS, while the bronze coinage under Titus and Domitian makes

⁷ Mattingly-Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, II, pp. 28 and 39.

⁸ Dessau, *ILS*, 6049-6052; for the significance of the *Victoria Augusti* see J. Gagé, *La Théologie de la Victoire Impériale*, *Rev. Hist.* CLXXI, 1934, 1; for the emphasis laid upon the heirs of the house, the 'liberi,' cf. coins with the legend LIBERI IMP. AUG. VESPAS. (Mattingly-Sydenham, *l.c.*, 52-54).

this more particular by displaying the legend AETERNITATI AVGVSTI.⁹ On some of these coins *Aeternitas* is represented as holding heads of the Sun and Moon, and this representation may owe something to earlier Hellenistic art, but I doubt whether any reference to that fluid entity, the Graeco-Egyptian AION, was intended here. Rather it is the eternity of the Roman state and of the Flavian dynasty that is signified, and that, too, first just after Vespasian's great work of restoration had been crowned by his censorship (A.D. 73-74) and the holding of the lustrum. 'From Vespasian's time onward,' wrote Professor Costa in 1923, 'the adjective *aeternus* enters into what we may call the court-language, though not yet into official use,' and the detailed proof of this statement has now been supplied in a dissertation by Dr. F. Sauter.¹⁰

Domitian carried on the work of his father. The restored temple of Jupiter was burnt down again. Domitian rebuilt it again with the utmost magnificence; hence the issue of coins commemorating CAPIT(olium) RESTIT(utum). On the coinage of the Flavians Vesta appears more frequently than any other god or goddess, and we have seen how Vesta and the Capitol stood for symbols of eternity to the Roman mind. This may explain the severity of the punishment that Domitian meted out to the Vestal who was alleged to have broken her vows; he felt it to be a danger to the *aeternitas* of Rome, and one only to be met by the horrid ritual that tradition prescribed.¹¹ He made manifest, too, his personal devotion to Jupiter. That god had saved him in the days when he had fled from the burning Capitol; he dedicated to him a small shrine, and later when he had become emperor, he built a large temple to Iuppiter Custos, with the image of the god holding him in his arms.¹² Hence probably the coins of 75-79 figuring IOVIS

⁹ Mattingly-Sydenham, l.c., 28 and 39; 131 and 134n.; 191 and 192 (A.D. 85).

¹⁰ G. Costa, *Religione e Politica nell' Impero Romano*, 1923, 82. For details see F. Sauter's dissertation, *Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius*, where he shows that Martial and Statius constantly refer to Domitian as *aeternus*. But I do not agree with his interpretation of the AETERNITAS issue. Cumont has shown, op. cit., 440, how all the attributes of the emperor, Virtus, Pax, Victoria, Felicitas, etc., become *aeternae* in the third century.

¹¹ Pliny, Ep. IV, 11; Suetonius, Domit. 8; Dio Cassius, LXVII, 3.

¹² Tacitus, Hist. III, 74.

CVSTOS, and certainly those of 84 to 86, with the legend IOVI CONSERVATORI or IVPPITER CVSTOS, and it has been remarked that upon some of these coins Jupiter has features suspiciously like Domitian's.¹³ In fact this temple was not merely a mark of gratitude for help in the past; it must also have signified that the emperor was under the protection of the greatest god of Rome. The connection was stressed by the games which Domitian founded in Jupiter's honour in the year 86: over these he himself presided, wearing a golden crown bearing the heads of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, the Capitoline triad; his fellow-priests bore on their crowns his own image as well.¹⁴

This known devotion to religion and to the chief Roman gods was coupled in Domitian with an extreme assertiveness; the emperor begins to appear not only as the guardian of the state, but also, in some sense, as a 'pignus imperii' himself. A fortunate chance has preserved for us fragments of the prayers of the Arval Brethren for the years 86, 87, and 90, and out of these Henzen reconstructed the general formula: it runs —

Iuppiter optime maxime Capitoline, si imperator Caesar divi Vespasiani filius Domitianus Augustus . . . ex cuius incolumitate omnium [*or universorum*] salus constat, . . . vivet domusque eius incolumis erit, . . . eumque in eo statu, quo nunc est, aut eo meliore servaveris, custodierisque aeternitatem imperi, quod suscipiendo ampliavit, —

and then follow the vows. It must be to some clause such as this that the younger Pliny refers, when he declares, 'nuncupare vota pro aeternitate imperii et pro salute principum, *immo pro salute principum ac propter illos pro aeternitate imperii solebamus.*'¹⁵ Domitian's is the life on which the safety of all hangs, on Domitian's safety depends the eternity of the empire.

The Flavian emperors, then, were closely linked with Jupiter and Vesta, the two deities who signified the lasting life of the state;¹⁶ on the safety of Domitian depended the safety of all,

¹³ See A. Alföldi, *Insignien und Tracht der römischen Kaiser*, *Römische Mittheilungen*, L, 1935, esp. 103. For the coins see Mattingly-Sydenham, l.c., 28, 36, and 39; also 185, 188, 192, 194, and 196.

¹⁴ The institution of the Capitoline *agon*; Suetonius, *Domit.* 4, 4.

¹⁵ The formula of the Arval vows; Henzen, l.c., 110. Compare with this Pliny, *Paneg.* 67, 3.

¹⁶ As early as A.D. 30, when Velleius Paterculus wishes to conclude his history with

he was the embodiment of the eternity of the state. Perhaps one of the greatest achievements of the Flavians was the restoration of confidence, and of this returning confidence we have a curious instance in an inscription from Acmonia in Phrygia. The Senate and people had received a legacy from one of their rich citizens, and arranged for its disposal by a decree. There were to be shows and distributions, the benefaction was to be perpetual; then follows a significant sentence, that the validity of the decree is to be guaranteed 'by the eternity of the empire of Rome,' τοῦτο δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα νενομοθετηῆσθαι τῷ αἰῶνι τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας φυλαχθῆσόμενον —.¹⁷

The Flavian heritage was not abandoned by the succeeding emperors; it held its effect. When Nerva was looking for a man to adopt as son and heir, and so secure a stable succession, he chose Trajan, and he carried through the ceremony of adoption — not, like Galba, before the Praetorians — but with the greatest solemnity before Jupiter himself upon the Capitol.¹⁸ In Trajan's reign we witness something like the fulfilment of the process that began with Augustus and was so much furthered by the Flavians: belief in the *aeternitas imperii*, guarded by the foresight and action of the Princeps, about whose person and work there clings the quality of *aeternitas* too. Poets before had used the word *aeternus* of the Princeps and his house, — Ovid, Statius, Martial, — now with the reign of the 'providentissimus Princeps' coins tell of the AETERNITAS AVGVSTI, and Pliny's Letters show the sentiments not only of the provincials but of the sober-minded Pliny himself. On the occasion of Trajan's birthday he writes from Bithynia, — 'sollemnia vota pro incolumitate tua, qua publica salus con-

a solemn vow (II, 131), the three deities he selects are Iuppiter Capitolinus, Mars Gradivus, and Vesta. P. K. Gross, in his penultimate section (i.e., 117 ff.) dealing with Sonstige Unterpfänder Roms, remarks, 'Sie lassen sich nach zwei Gruppen scheiden. Die andere stehen in Beziehung zum Vestaheiligtum, die anderen zum kapitolinischen Hügel.' As Cumont noted, in 1896, 'le foyer de Vesta devint ainsi le symbole non seulement de l'indestructibilité de l'État romain, mais de celle du principat.' To this I would merely add that the Flavians promoted it greatly.

¹⁷ Acmonia: IGRR (Cagnat-Lafaye), IV, 661. The date is 85, the same year as the issue of the Domitianic AETERNITATI AVGVSTI coins.

¹⁸ Nerva's adoption of Trajan: Pliny, Paneg. 8, and Dio Cassius LXVIII, 3, 3 and 4.

tinetur, et suscepimus, domine, pariter et solvimus,' or again, 'diem, domine, quo servasti imperium, dum suscipis, quanta mereris laetitia, celebravimus precati deos, ut te generi humano, cuius tutela et securitas saluti tuae innisa est, incolumem florentemque praestarent.'¹⁹ Phrasing and tone here are strongly reminiscent of the prayer of the Arval Brethren under Domitian; the safety of the people depends upon the safety of the Princeps. How this appeared to the provincials is revealed by the fact that the strongest form of petition that they could put forward to Pliny was by the 'Salus et Aeternitas' of the emperor.²⁰ To Pliny himself Trajan is the ruler 'cuius factis dictisque debetur aeternitas,' while a piece of work is 'non minus aeternitate tua quam gloria digna.'²¹ *Aeternitas tua*, in fact, has started on its career towards becoming a court-title, even though the end of that career, when Gallus Caesar could refer to himself complacently as 'Aeternitas mea,' or Symmachus speak of 'Aeternitas vestra,' is yet far off.²²

By Hadrian's time, then, the *Aeternitas* of the emperor (and of his family) and the belief in the *Aeternitas imperii* (as safeguarded by the emperor) are well established. From his reign onwards we observe how Rome becomes ROMA AETERNA, both upon coins and in inscriptions, until by the time of Ammianus Marcellinus it is 'urbs aeterna' beyond dispute.²³ Perhaps another sign, too, of this feeling is the number of 'Capitols' that appear in the provinces, in many of the large colonies or municipalities.²⁴ As *Aeternitas* is so much an attribute of the emperor and his house it is used naturally enough to signify the apotheosis of a ruler or of members of his family. AETER-NITAS had already been associated with DIVVS AVGVSTVS on coins of Spain and with DIVVS VESPASIANVS in the reign of Titus, and so appears regularly in representations of apotheosis of members of the Antonine house, Sabina or Fau-

¹⁹ Pliny, Ep. X, 35 (44) and 52 (60).

²⁰ Pliny, Ep. X, 59 (67) and 83 (87).

²¹ Pliny, Ep. X, 112 (113), 3, and 41 (50).

²² Ammianus Marcellinus, XV, I, 3; Symmachus (O. Seeck), Relat. II, 2 and III, 3 (I owe the Symmachus references to Cumont's article).

²³ Ammianus Marcellinus, XIV, 6, 1; XV, 7, 1 and 7, 10; XVI, 10, 14, and eight other times.

²⁴ J. Toutain, Les Cultes païens dans l'Empire romain, I, 1907, 181-193.

stina.²⁵ Down to this time we may regard the complex of associations which clustered round the word *Aeternitas* as being mainly Roman and native: from Hadrian's time onwards, as Cumont has well shown, various cross-currents flow in, — the influence of the various 'aeterni' gods from Syria, of solar monotheism, and of astrological and fatalistic teachings. All these entered in and changed, altered and developed the original significance of *Aeternitas*, and the results can be seen in Cumont's study. Here we have tried merely to show the beginnings of the process, and to show, too, how deeply it was rooted in native Italian and Roman traditional ideas.

3. CONCLUSION

A few remarks in conclusion. In the two preceding sections I have tried to show the manner in which *Providentia* and *Aeternitas* gradually came to be so associated with the emperor that by the middle of the second century they could be regarded as attributes of his. As far as possible I have dealt with the texts and the coins in chronological order, as being the only proper method of reviewing evidence for the growth of the meaning or sentiment attaching to a word: to use a Diocletianic inscription to illustrate a usage in Augustan or Flavian times is utterly uncritical. If this evidence has been correctly arranged and interpreted *Providentia* had an interesting history, and its development seems to be peculiarly Roman. The great Hellenistic monarchs, say a man like Antigonos Gonatas, certainly had their subjects' welfare at heart as much as Augustus or Hadrian, but I do not think we meet with the word *Pronoia*. In Hellenistic political philosophy the King must love his subjects, he must benefit them, he must bring about Homonoia ('Ομόνοια) among them, and he is himself Living Law.¹ Yet to some extent he resembles a beneficent judge, and we may perhaps compare him with Dante's mediaeval Roman Emperor, to whom he assigns the role of arbi-

²⁵ See Mrs Arthur Strong, *Apotheosis and After Life*, especially 88 ff.

¹ For Hellenistic ideas of monarchy see E. R. Goodenough, *The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship*, Yale Class. Stud. I, 1928, 55, passim, and the fascinating study by W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind*, British Acad. Proc. XIX, 1933, esp. 3-9.

trator and peace-maker between discordant parties: 'the monarch is to be, in principle, the sole earthly fountain of justice, and with him will rest the final decision of all legal disputes.'² The attribution to the ruler of *Providentia*, that is of a paternal and loving forethought for his people, of a continual steady drive of good will, seems to be Roman in its origin and its development. And it is possible that this idea found its way from Rome to the Greek East, and there gave a new significance to *Pronoia*. Whereas in the decree of the Asiatic cities (p. 109) it is the cosmic divine *Pronoia* that had sent Augustus to a suffering world, in Dio Chrysostom and in subsequent Greek writers *Pronoia* has become something intimately connected with the ruler, something expected of him, much more a translation of *Providentia Augusti*. But it does not matter extremely (to my mind) whether the idea was originally Roman or not: the important thing is that for some centuries, under the empire, it was splendidly carried out in action and became a part of people's thought.

Needless to say I have not dealt with all the inscriptions or coins available, though I hope to have included nearly all those of importance down to the time of the Antonines. That appears to be a suitable limit, since by then the words *Providentia* or *Aeternitas* had gathered about them a certain well-defined group of meanings. It is likely that we moderns may sometimes try to be too precise about these meanings: after all, phrases in Latin (as the Editor has pointed out to me) were not written with a view to translation, and they were liable to receive an emotional rather than an intellectual exegesis. Yet in spite of the difficulties I hope this essay may help to make clearer some of the meanings, and such as it is I offer it as a small contribution to the history of imperial religious and political thought.

² W. H. V. Reade, Introduction to E. Moore's text of Dante's *de Monarchia*, Oxford, 1916, xiv-xv. I owe the reference to Dr. C. W. Previté-Orton.

THE POSITION OF HEBREWS IN THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

WILLIAM H. P. HATCH

EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE manuscripts and versions of the New Testament, in lists of books accepted as canonical, and in the works of ecclesiastical writers the Epistle to the Hebrews occupies three different positions: (I) Among the epistles addressed to churches, i.e. after Romans, after 2 Corinthians, and very rarely after Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, and Titus. (II) After 2 Thessalonians, i.e. after the epistles written to churches. (III) After Philemon, i.e. at the end of the Pauline canon.¹ Each of these positions represents the usage of some particular section, or sections, of the Church; and each is significant for the history of the canon of the New Testament. No other epistle ascribed to the Apostle Paul has been so variously placed in the canon as Hebrews.

(I) The Epistle to the Hebrews follows immediately after Romans in the recently discovered Beatty-Michigan papyrus of the first half of the third century (P⁴⁶),² in six minuscule manuscripts,³ and in a Syrian canon composed about 400 A.D.⁴

¹ Most of the evidence for putting Hebrews in each of these places can be found in Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Graece* (eighth ed., Leipzig, 1869-1872); but some facts have come to light since the publication of this monumental work, and it seems worth while to collect all the evidence known at the present time and present it in one place.

² Of this papyrus codex of the Pauline Epistles eighty-six leaves are extant. Fifty-six are in the library of Mr. A. Chester Beatty in London (Chester Beatty Papyrus II), and thirty are in the Library of the University of Michigan (P. Michigan 222). See Sir F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri* (London, 1933-1934), I, 6 f.; and III, v ff. and 1 ff.; H. A. Sanders, *A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul* (Ann Arbor, 1935); and Sir F. G. Kenyon in the *American Journal of Philology*, LVII, 91 ff.

³ Codd. 103, 455, 1961, 1964, 1977, and 1994. The earliest of these (103) was written in the eleventh century. The others range from the thirteenth or fourteenth to the sixteenth century in date.

⁴ This canon is preserved in a ninth century manuscript at Mount Sinai (Cod. Syr. 10). Cf. A. S. Lewis, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the Convent of*

Hence in Egypt in the third century and in Syria in the fourth century Hebrews sometimes stood between Romans and 1 Corinthians. However, as we shall presently see, it did not always have this position in the third and fourth centuries. Romans, 1 Corinthians, and Hebrews (in this order) are the longest of the New Testament epistles, 2 Corinthians being about two-thirds as long as 1 Corinthians. The longer epistles were grouped together. Romans, being the longest and most important, was put first; Hebrews on grounds of doctrine might naturally be ranked next to Romans; and the two letters addressed to the church in Corinth, one of them being the shortest of the group, were placed last. This arrangement is certainly not illogical.

Sometimes, on the other hand, Hebrews follows next after 2 Corinthians. The epistle occupies this position in two minuscule manuscripts⁵ and in a codex containing the commentary of Theophylact on the Pauline Epistles.⁶ Hebrews was placed after 2 Corinthians also in the Sahidic version, as the few extant manuscripts of this earliest Coptic translation of the New Testament testify. In addition to the fragmentary codex in the Museo Borgiano at Velletri, described by Zoega⁷ and cited by Tischendorf, three other witnesses, which have come to light in recent years, should be adduced: the Beatty manuscript in London⁸ and two Morgan codices in New York.⁹ The Beatty manuscript was written about 600 A.D. in the Monastery of

S. Catharine on Mount Sinai (London, 1894), 11 ff.; T. Zahn, *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (second ed., Leipzig, 1904), 86; and A. Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (New York, 1913), 226. The list includes the four Gospels in the usual order, Acts, and the Pauline Epistles. Hebrews occupies the fifth place among the letters ascribed to the Apostle.

⁵ Codd. 1930 (saec. XVI) and 1978 (saec. XV).

⁶ Cod. 2248 (saec. XIV). The commentary on Hebrews follows immediately after that on 2 Corinthians. Cf. W. H. P. Hatch, *The Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament in Jerusalem* (Paris, 1934), Plate XLVII, note 2.

⁷ Cf. G. Zoega, *Catalogus Codicum Copticorum Manu Scriptorum qui in Museo Borgiano Velitris adservantur* (Rome, 1810), 186 (No. LXXX).

⁸ Cod. A. Cf. Sir H. Thompson, *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect* (Cambridge, 1932).

⁹ Morgan Library, M 570 and M 571. Cf. H. Hyvernât, *A Check List of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library* (New York, 1919), 4.

Apa Jeremias at Saqqâra; and the two Morgan codices, which were discovered on the site of the Monastery of the Archangel Michael on the southern border of the Fayûm, are ascribed to the ninth century. In these three Sahidic manuscripts Hebrews follows immediately after 2 Corinthians. Finally, in a Sahidic translation of the thirty-ninth Festal Letter of Athanasius Hebrews is mentioned between the two epistles to the Corinthians and the letter to the Galatians.¹⁰ This list was doubtless made to conform to the Sahidic canon of the Pauline Epistles. The putting of Hebrews next after 2 Corinthians is quite defensible. Romans and 1 Corinthians, being the longest letters, were placed first; and 2 Corinthians was allowed to stand immediately after 1 Corinthians. Then Hebrews, which is also a long epistle, was put next. It is clear from the evidence cited above that Hebrews had this position in Upper Egypt and probably elsewhere at an early date.

In the archetype of Codex Vaticanus the Epistle to the Hebrews came next after Galatians. This is shown by the numbering of chapters in the Pauline Epistles which is found in Codex Vaticanus. The chapter numeration begins with Romans and runs continuously through 2 Thessalonians. Originally it must have extended to the end of the Pauline corpus. In this series of chapter numbers Hebrews intervenes between Galatians and Ephesians.¹¹ This numbering of chapters was undoubtedly taken from the archetype of Codex Vaticanus, which probably derived the system from some earlier source. When or where it originated is unknown. No manuscript or version and no list of canonical books or ecclesiastical writer betrays any acquaintance with it. Perhaps the archetype of Codex Vaticanus represented in this matter some primitive local use which was afterwards completely forgotten. In any

¹⁰ Cf. C. Schmidt in *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1898, 174. In the Greek original of this letter and in the Syriac translation of it published by Cureton Hebrews follows immediately after the two epistles to the Thessalonians. Cf. W. Cureton, *The Festal Letters of Athanasius* (London, 1848), 53 (Syriac letters).

¹¹ In Galatians, Hebrews, and Ephesians the chapters are numbered thus: in Galatians 54 (NΔ) to 59 (NΘ); in Hebrews 60 (Ξ) to 64 (ΞΔ); in Ephesians 70 (Ο) to 75 (ΟΕ). Doubtless there were originally ten chapters in Hebrews.

case it contributes additional testimony to the fact that before the fourth century the position of Hebrews among the Pauline Epistles varied greatly in different quarters.

For the sake of completeness two other positions occupied by Hebrews should be mentioned here. In one minuscule manuscript the epistle follows immediately after Ephesians;¹² and in the *Institutiones Divinarum et Saecularium Lectionum* of Cassiodorus, which was composed about the middle of the sixth century, it comes next after Colossians.¹³ These references, however, are probably not significant. The position of Hebrews was fixed both in the East and in the West before the middle of the sixth century, and there was apparently no reason for putting the epistle either after Ephesians or after Colossians.

As we have already seen, the Epistle to the Hebrews stood among the letters written to churches as early as the third century. If it had not been recognized as in some sense a work of the Apostle, it would not have been given this place in the Pauline corpus. However, it occupied this position only in the East; for in this early period it was not accepted as canonical in the West.

(II) The Epistle to the Hebrews stands immediately after 2 Thessalonians, i.e. between the letters addressed to churches and those written to individuals, in nine uncial manuscripts¹⁴ and in at least sixty minuscule codices.¹⁵ No Latin or Syriac manuscripts have the epistle in this place.

Bohairic codices are divided in respect to the position of Hebrews. Of nineteen manuscripts mentioned by Horner there are fourteen in which the epistle is placed between 2 Thessa-

¹² Cod. 606 (saec. XI).

¹³ Cf. *Institutiones Divinarum et Saecularium Lectionum*, 14 (Migne, P. L. LXX, col. 1125).

¹⁴ Codd. 8ABCHIP 0150, 0151.

¹⁵ Codd. 5, 33, 38, 62, 88, 91, 94, 122, 131, 181, 218, 255, 256, 263, 302, 436, 442, 460, 611, 623, 632, 680, 699, 794, 927, 1099, 1106, 1175, 1288, 1352, 1827, 1828, 1836, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1843, 1845, 1851, 1868, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1877, 1881, 1885, 1889, 1898, 1908, 1912, 1942, 1945, 1947, 1962, 1963, 1969, 1996, 1999, 2012, 2298. These manuscripts range from the ninth or tenth century to the sixteenth century in date. Cod. 1359, which had Hebrews immediately after 2 Thessalonians, has disappeared. Cf. W. H. P. Hatch, *op. cit.*, 10 f.

lonians and 1 Timothy,¹⁶ and among these fourteen are one which was written in the twelfth century (Γ) and three which date from the thirteenth century (DEJ₂). These are the oldest extant codices containing the Pauline Epistles in the Bohairic dialect. However, three of those which do not agree with the manuscripts just mentioned in putting Hebrews next after 2 Thessalonians were copied in the fourteenth century (CKL). The difference in date of these codices is not very significant. Nevertheless, those which have the epistle between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy in all probability represent the earlier Bohairic usage in regard to the position of Hebrews. One would expect to find the epistle in this place in the version used in Lower Egypt, and Horner is undoubtedly right in putting it here in his edition of the Bohairic translation of the New Testament.¹⁷

The Graeco-Latin Codex Claromontanus contains a Latin list of the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, and it is probable that in the Greek original of this list Hebrews was mentioned immediately after 2 Thessalonians. The translator or some copyist was careless; and Philippians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, and probably Hebrews have been omitted after Ephesians.¹⁸ Harnack regards the list, which is independent of Codex Claromontanus in origin, as Alexandrian; and he assigns it to the third century or to the beginning of the fourth.¹⁹ If, however, as appears highly probable, Hebrews originally followed 2 Thessalonians in this list, the early part of the fourth century seems to the present writer a more probable date for the composition of it than the third century. For in the latter century, as has been said above, Egyptian Christians were accustomed to see Hebrews standing next in order after Romans

¹⁶ Codd. A₁ B Γ D E₁ E₂ F G J₁ J₂ M N O P.

¹⁷ D. Wilkins, the editor of the *editio princeps* of the Bohairic version, says: 'Ordo autem Epistolarum Pauli in omnibus Codicibus Copticis talis est, qualem nos observamus, nisi quod Epistola ad Hebraeos praeponatur Epistolis ad Timotheum' (Novum Testamentum Aegyptium vulgo Copticum, Oxford, 1716, Prolegg., VIII). Nevertheless, he placed Hebrews after Philemon in his edition.

¹⁸ Cf. T. Zahn, Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons (Erlangen and Leipzig, 1888-1890), II, 164 and 171.

¹⁹ Cf. A. Harnack, Die Chronologie der althristlichen Litteratur (Leipzig, 1897-1904), II, 84 ff.

or 2 Corinthians. The aforesaid list, as hypothetically reconstructed, is the earliest catalogue of canonical writings which has the Epistle to the Hebrews between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy.

The earliest patristic writer who bears witness to the fact that Hebrews sometimes stood immediately after 2 Thessalonians in the canon of the New Testament is Athanasius. In his thirty-ninth Festal Letter, written in the year 367, this great Alexandrian theologian mentions in order twenty-seven books of the New Testament as canonical, and he puts the Epistle to the Hebrews between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy without noting any diversity of opinion in regard to the position of Hebrews.²⁰ The Syriac version of the thirty-ninth Festal Letter agrees with the Greek text in placing Hebrews next after 2 Thessalonians. In the Sahidic translation of this letter, however, as we have already seen, Hebrews follows 2 Corinthians; but since this is the position occupied by the epistle in the Sahidic version of the New Testament, it is obvious that the translator of the Festal Letter has simply conformed Athanasius's text to the Sahidic canon.

The next witness to be adduced is Euthalius, whose life and personality are involved in much obscurity. In the Euthalian prologue to the Pauline Epistles Hebrews is mentioned between the two epistles to the Thessalonians and the two letters to Timothy.²¹ According to Armitage Robinson this prologue is probably to be accepted as genuine.²² If this is so, then the Pauline Epistles must have been read in the above-given order where Euthalius lived, or he must have used a manuscript which had them in this order. Robinson thinks the date of Euthalius's scholarly activity was 'not later than 350 A.D.'²³

²⁰ A considerable fragment of this letter has been preserved in Greek, Syriac, and Coptic (Sahidic). The Greek text is printed by T. Zahn, *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (second ed., Leipzig, 1904), 87 f.; and by A. Souter, *op. cit.*, 213 f. For the Syriac see W. Cureton, *op. cit.*, 52 ff. (Syriac letters). The Sahidic version is given by C. Schmidt in *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl.*, 1898, 169 ff.

²¹ Cf. Migne, P. G. LXXXV, col. 705.

²² Cf. J. A. Robinson in *Texts and Studies*, III, 3, p. 27.

²³ Cf. *Texts and Studies*, III, 3, p. 101. On the other hand according to von Dobschütz Euthalius flourished in the second half of the fifth century. Cf. *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, X, 68.

The prologues to the Acts and the Catholic Epistles are addressed to one Athanasius, who is mentioned in the body of both prologues as well as in the titles. This has sometimes been thought to be Athanasius II, who became bishop of Alexandria in the year 490; but the English scholar just quoted identifies the Athanasius of the Euthalian prologues with Athanasius the Great, who died in 373 A.D.²⁴ The mention of the name Athanasius naturally suggests Alexandria or Egypt as the place where Euthalius lived; but, as Robinson says, 'on so slight an indication we cannot lay much stress.'²⁵ However, the fact that the prologue to the Pauline Epistles mentions Hebrews between the two epistles to the Thessalonians and the two letters to Timothy points in that direction. In this respect the Euthalian prologue resembles the Alexandrian manuscripts **NBI** and the thirty-ninth Festal Letter of Athanasius.²⁶

Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus and an ardent champion of the orthodox faith, says that some manuscripts of the New Testament 'have the Epistle to the Hebrews tenth (in order) before the two to Timothy.'²⁷ Epiphanius was born in Palestine early in the fourth century; but he spent much of his early life in Egypt, and there he may have become acquainted with copies of the New Testament which had Hebrews between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy.

Jerome, writing to the presbyter Paulinus probably about the year 394, speaks of Hebrews as the eighth of Paul's epistles and mentions it just after the letters addressed to churches.²⁸ Then follow the names of Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. Hebrews does not occupy this position either in the Vulgate or in Old Latin manuscripts; but Jerome was acquainted with Greek codices of the type that had the Epistle to the Hebrews

²⁴ Cf. *Texts and Studies*, III, 3, p. 31. Von Dobschütz, however, thinks the person addressed in the Euthalian prologues was neither of these bishops of Alexandria. Cf. *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, X, 65.

²⁵ Cf. *Texts and Studies*, III, 3, p. 43.

²⁶ The Euthalian apparatus was known in Caesarea at a comparatively early date, but there is no clear evidence that Euthalius himself belonged to that locality. Cf. K. Lake, *The Text of the New Testament* (sixth ed., London, 1928), 59 f.; and *Texts and Studies*, III, 3, pp. 44 ff.

²⁷ Cf. *Migne*, P. G. XLI, col. 812.

²⁸ Cf. *Epist. LIII*, 8 (*Migne*, P. L. XXII, col. 548).

immediately after 2 Thessalonians, and not long after completing the Vulgate he visited Alexandria and the Nitrian desert. However, being a wise translator, he avoided making unnecessary innovations, and he allowed Hebrews to remain in the place where Western Christians were accustomed to see it.

Cyril of Alexandria, in his treatise entitled *De Recta Fide ad Reginas*, quotes passages from various books of the New Testament in order to prove certain theological propositions. The quotations from each book are grouped together under the appropriate heading (*ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Κορινθίους πρῶτης*, etc.), and the groups of prooftexts are arranged in canonical order. Those taken from the Epistle to the Hebrews precede those from 1 Timothy.²⁹ Cyril was born in Alexandria, and with the exception of a five years' sojourn in the Nitrian desert he spent all his life in the city of his birth. In quoting passages from the Pauline Epistles he naturally followed the order in which he was accustomed to read the Apostle's letters.

In Egypt during the third century, as we have seen, the Epistle to the Hebrews usually followed Romans or 2 Corinthians. In view of the testimony adduced above—Greek manuscripts, the Bohairic version, and the patristic writers just cited—the custom of putting Hebrews next after 2 Thessalonians appears to be Alexandrian. Now the New Testament text was revised at Alexandria about the beginning of the fourth century; and our two oldest vellum manuscripts, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, show traces of this revision. The work of revision is attributed by many scholars to one Hesychius, and to him may be due the Alexandrian order of the Pauline Epistles. Or, if Euthalius really lived 'not later than 350 A.D.,' it is possible that Hebrews was placed between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy by him.

Three other writers must also be mentioned. Theodoret, a native of Antioch in Syria and bishop of Cyrrhus in the district of Cyrrhестice, was the author of many theological works, and among them are commentaries on all the Pauline Epistles. As a theologian Theodoret was opposed to Cyril of Alexandria,

²⁹ Cf. Migne, P. G. LXXVI, cols. 1249 ff. and 1296. It happens that no quotations from 1 or 2 Thessalonians are given in either of these places.

and as an exegete he was a disciple of the Antiochian school. His exegetical methods and principles were those of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Theodoret regarded the Epistle to the Hebrews as Pauline, and in his commentary it stands immediately after 2 Thessalonians.³⁰ Since he had no direct or personal connections with Alexandria, it is altogether probable that he found Hebrews in this position in the New Testament manuscripts which he used. The latter or their archetypes were probably brought from Egypt to Syria, perhaps by way of Caesarea.

Cosmas Indicopleustes, an Alexandrian merchant and traveler of the sixth century, recounts in order the various Christian communities and individuals to whom each of the Pauline Epistles is addressed. He undoubtedly recognized fourteen letters as genuine writings of the Apostle, though he does not say that in some cases two letters were written to the same community or person. Cosmas mentions the Hebrews next after the Thessalonians as the recipients of an epistle.³¹ He also declares that Paul wrote Hebrews in Hebrew, and he gives as a traditional or popular opinion (*ὡς φασιν*) the view that the epistle was translated into Greek by Luke or Clement (i.e. Clement of Rome).³²

John of Damascus, who died about the middle of the eighth century, is the last witness to be cited in behalf of the Alexandrian order of the Pauline Epistles. In his *Loci Selecti in Epistolas Sancti Pauli* he has collected comments on each of the

³⁰ Cf. Migne, P. G. LXXXII, cols. 673 ff. A fourteenth century manuscript in the Greek Patriarchal Library in Jerusalem (Cod. Saba 217 = Gregory 2012), containing Theodoret's commentary on the Pauline Epistles, has the commentary on Hebrews next after that on 2 Thessalonians. Cf. W. H. P. Hatch, *op. cit.*, Plate LI.

³¹ Cf. Migne, P. G. LXXXVIII, col. 304.

³² Cf. Migne, P. G. LXXXVIII, col. 305. Clement of Alexandria is the earliest writer who mentions the hypothesis that Luke translated the epistle from Hebrew into Greek. Cf. Eusebius, H. E., VI, 14, 2; and *Adumbrationes Clementis Alexandrini in Epistolas Canonicas* (in T. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, Erlangen and Leipzig, 1881-1929, III, 83). In another place Eusebius gives this view and adds the alternative theory that Clement of Rome was the translator. Eusebius himself considered the latter more probable. Cf. H. E., III, 38, 2 and 3. Origen knew through tradition or hearsay that some thought Luke was the author of Hebrews, and that others believed Clement of Rome wrote it. Cf. H. E., VI, 25, 14. The notion that Luke or Clement of Rome translated the epistle from Hebrew into Greek is a later development. It doubtless arose from the two above-given opinions concerning the authorship of Hebrews when the latter was attributed to the Apostle Paul.

epistles of the Apostle, and those on Hebrews are placed immediately after those on 2 Thessalonians.³³ He probably used manuscripts in which Hebrews occupied this position. In respect to the order of the Pauline Epistles John of Damascus followed the tradition of Alexandria.

In the pseudo-Athanasian *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* fourteen epistles of Paul are enumerated, and Hebrews is mentioned between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy.³⁴ However, this manual of introduction to the Old and New Testaments is a late work. It was compiled by some unknown writer not earlier than the sixth century, and it may be of still later date.³⁵ Nevertheless, it is interesting that a document of this period should preserve the Alexandrian tradition concerning the position of Hebrews among the Pauline Epistles. Some of the author's sources doubtless had the Apostle's letters in this order.

Something must now be said about the very dubious evidence contained in the Fifty-ninth (or Sixtieth) Canon of the Council of Laodicea. The exact date of this council is not known; but it was certainly held sometime between 345 and 380 A.D., and probably about the year 360.³⁶ The Fifty-ninth Canon of Laodicea provides that only the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments should be read in the services of the Church. In some Greek manuscripts there is appended to this canon a list of the canonical books of the two covenants; and in others the catalogue of accepted writings forms a separate canon, which bears the number 60. The Epistle to the Hebrews is mentioned next after 2 Thessalonians.³⁷ But the oldest extant Greek manuscript of the Laodicean canons and the Syriac translation of these canons do not contain the catalogue of sacred books; and several ecclesiastical writers, both Greek and Latin, quote Canon 59 without the list.³⁸ In view of these facts there can be no doubt that the catalogue of canoni-

³³ Cf. Migne, P. G. XCV, col. 929.

³⁴ Cf. Migne, P. G. XXVIII, col. 293.

³⁵ Cf. T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen and Leipzig, 1888-1890), II, 302 ff.

³⁶ Cf. T. Zahn, *op. cit.*, II, 193 ff.

³⁷ Zahn gives the text of the list in *op. cit.*, II, 202.

³⁸ Cf. T. Zahn, *op. cit.*, II, 198 f.

cal books appended to Canon 59 (or forming Canon 60) is not a part of the legislation enacted by the Council of Laodicea. It is clearly a much later addition.³⁹ The so-called Laodicean Canon may have been drawn up in Asia Minor, as Zahn suggests;⁴⁰ but as regards the position of Hebrews it betrays the direct or indirect influence of Alexandria.⁴¹

(III) The Epistle to the Hebrews is often found immediately after Philemon, i.e. at the end of the Pauline canon. It occupies this position in four uncial manuscripts⁴² and in most minuscule codices.⁴³ In the fourth century Epiphanius, as we have seen, knew some manuscripts in which Hebrews stood between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy according to the Alexandrian tradition; but he was also acquainted with other codices which had the epistle after Philemon.⁴⁴ These probably represented the recension of the New Testament text which is believed to have been made by Lucian at Antioch about the year 300. Also in the fourth century Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, in his *Iambi ad Seleucum*, reckons fourteen epistles as Pauline, beginning with Romans and ending with Hebrews. The latter is mentioned next after Philemon, and the opinion that the epistle is not a genuine work of Paul is cited and rejected.⁴⁵

³⁹ Zahn thinks that the list of canonical books was appended to Canon 59 between 600 and 800 A.D., and that it was an earlier catalogue which up to that time had not won general acceptance. Cf. *op. cit.*, II, 200 f.

⁴⁰ Cf. T. Zahn, *op. cit.*, II, 201.

⁴¹ Zahn points out that in designating Genesis *Γένεσις Κόσμου* and Exodus *Ἐξόδος Αἰγύπτου* the Laodicean Canon agrees with the index found in Codex Alexandrinus. Cf. *op. cit.*, II, 201. However, the differences between the two lists, both in the Old Testament and in the New, are more striking than their agreement in the matter just mentioned. For example, fourteen Pauline Epistles are recognized in the catalogue contained in Codex Alexandrinus, but they are not named. Moreover, the list given in Codex Alexandrinus includes the Apocalypse, 1 and 2 Clement, and the Psalms of Solomon; whereas the Laodicean Canon ends with Philemon.

⁴² Codd. DEKL. It is said that the text of D and E is 'Western,' that of K 'Western' and Byzantine, and that of L largely Antiochian-Byzantine. Cf. H. A. Sanders, *op. cit.*, 26 f.

⁴³ About 329 minuscule manuscripts are known to have Hebrews next after Philemon. The minuscules are the leading representatives of the Antiochian-Byzantine text. Cf. H. A. Sanders, *op. cit.*, 26.

⁴⁴ Cf. Migne, P. G. XLI, cols. 809 and 812.

⁴⁵ Cf. Migne, P. G. XXXVII, col. 1597. These verses have sometimes been attributed to Gregory of Nazianzus.

Originally only thirteen epistles of Paul were accepted as canonical in the West.⁴⁶ But several Latin writers who flourished in the latter half of the fourth century cite Hebrews as a canonical book and as a work of the Apostle.⁴⁷ When the epistle was officially recognized, it was appended at the end of the Pauline corpus. This is clearly shown by the fact that a canon enacted by the Third Council of Carthage in the year 397 mentions thirteen epistles of Paul as a group without naming them individually, and then it adds the words 'eiusdem ad Hebraeos una.'⁴⁸ Later the so-called *Decretum Gelasianum de Libris Recipiendis et non Recipiendis*, which is traditionally ascribed to Popes Damasus, Gelasius, and Hormisdas, enumerates fourteen epistles of Paul and puts the Epistle to the Hebrews at the end of the list after Philemon.⁴⁹ This document, which is of a private and unofficial character, seems to have been composed in the first half of the sixth century. It is probably a product of Italy.⁵⁰ Likewise Cassiodorus, in his *Complexiones in Epistolas Apostolorum*, which was written about 572 A.D., places Hebrews immediately after Philemon.⁵¹ As one would expect in view of what has just been said, the Epistle to the Hebrews stands next after Philemon in Old Latin codices⁵² and

⁴⁶ The Muratorian Canon designates thirteen epistles of Paul by name, but it does not mention Hebrews. Cf. T. Zahn, *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (second ed., Leipzig, 1904), 80; and A. Souter, *op. cit.*, 209. Hebrews was not included in Marcion's canon, and originally there was no Marcionite prologue for the epistle. A prologue for Hebrews was provided much later, probably in the second half of the fourth century. Cf. A. Souter, *op. cit.*, 205 ff.

⁴⁷ Cf. A. Souter, *op. cit.*, 191.

⁴⁸ Cf. J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* (Florence and Venice, 1759-1798), III, col. 891.

⁴⁹ Cf. E. von Dobschütz in *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, Dritte Reihe, VIII, 4, p. 6; and A. Souter, *op. cit.*, 229 f. It is worthy of note that in all the manuscripts of the *Decretum Gelasianum* Hebrews stands at the end of the Pauline canon. Cf. von Dobschütz in *op. cit.*, p. 249. The so-called Damasine Decree or Roman Canon of the year 382 (see T. Zahn, *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, second ed., Leipzig, 1904, 84 f.) is not a document of independent value for the history of the canon. It is only one form of the *Decretum Gelasianum* and has no connection with Pope Damasus or the fourth century. Hebrews follows Philemon also in this form of the *Decretum Gelasianum*.

⁵⁰ Cf. E. von Dobschütz in *op. cit.*, Dritte Reihe, VIII, 4, pp. 334 ff.

⁵¹ Cf. Migne, P. L. LXX, col. 1357.

⁵² Codd. def. Old Latin manuscripts containing the Pauline corpus are rare.

in manuscripts of the Vulgate version.⁵³ Thus Hebrews occupied this position in the Latin-speaking churches of the West as early as the end of the fourth century, and it always retained this place in the Western Church.

In a Syrian canon composed about 400 A.D., as we have seen, Hebrews is mentioned next after Romans. However, in the manuscripts of the Peshittâ and Harclean versions the epistle is put immediately after Philemon,⁵⁴ and in all probability it occupied the same position in the lost translation which was made for Philoxenus of Mabûg. According to Junilius, a high official at the court of Justinian, Hebrews followed Philemon in the canon of the Church in Nisibis.⁵⁵ Junilius names as his authority a work on the Scriptures written by one Paul, 'a Persian by race, who was educated in the school of the Syrians in the city of Nisibis.'⁵⁶ This Paul was probably a Nestorian metropolitan of Nisibis who flourished about the middle of the sixth century.⁵⁷ In Syria, as in Egypt, during the third century the Epistle to the Hebrews stood next after Romans; but when the Peshittâ version was produced early in the fifth century, the epistle was placed after Philemon. In the making of this revision of the Old Syriac translation the Antiochian Greek text mentioned above was used, and to this influence the position of Hebrews in the Peshittâ is doubtless due.

In most Bohairic manuscripts, as we have seen, Hebrews comes next after 2 Thessalonians; but in five codices of this version it follows Philemon.⁵⁸ The latter, however, do not represent the genuine Bohairic tradition in respect to the position of the Epistle to the Hebrews. We have seen that Epipha-

⁵³ Berger notes only one exception, viz. a St. Gall manuscript of the eighth century (Cod. 70). He says it is unique in having Hebrews between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy, i.e. in the Alexandrian position. Cf. S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate* (Paris, 1893), 119 f., 342, and 417.

⁵⁴ The present writer knows of no Peshittâ or Harclean manuscript which has Hebrews in any other place.

⁵⁵ Cf. Migne, P. L. LXVIII, col. 19.

⁵⁶ Cf. Migne, P. L. LXVIII, col. 15.

⁵⁷ Cf. H. Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus als Exegeten* (Freiburg, 1880), 254 ff.

⁵⁸ Codd. CKLHA₂. C, K, and L were written in the fourteenth century. H is dated 1416 A.D., and A₂ was copied in 1794 A.D.

nius knew some Greek manuscripts which had the epistle after Philemon, and these Bohairic codices or their archetypes may have been influenced by manuscripts of the type mentioned by Epiphanius; or they may belong to a line of descent that has somehow come into contact with Syrian tradition. The Copts and the Jacobites both held the Monophysite faith; and the Syrian Convent of St. Mary Deipara in Nitria, commonly called Deir es-Sûriânî, was a near neighbour to several Coptic monasteries and a very important monastic centre. It had a great library, and many manuscripts were copied there.

The Armenian tradition in respect to the position of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the canon is not uniform. Both in codices and in printed editions its location varies. In a Copenhagen manuscript of the twelfth or thirteenth century⁵⁹ and in a Venice codex dated 1220 A.D.,⁶⁰ as well as in Zohrab's critical edition of 1805,⁶¹ the epistle stands between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy. This is probably the place which Hebrews should occupy in the existing Armenian version of the New Testament. On the other hand in Uscan's *editio princeps*, which is based on a single manuscript, Hebrews follows Philemon.⁶²

The origin of the Armenian translation of the New Testament is shrouded in much obscurity. Most scholars, following the account given by Moses of Khorene, think the version was made from the Old Syriac shortly before 400 A.D.⁶³ Others, in accordance with certain statements of Koriun and Lazar of P'arp, hold that it was made directly from a Greek text of the

⁵⁹ Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Cod. Armen. 1. Gregory does not indicate the position of Hebrews in any other manuscript in his list of Armenian codices. Cf. C. R. Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig, 1900-1909), II, 570 ff.

⁶⁰ Cf. F. C. Conybeare in *Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York, 1899-1904), I, 153. Conybeare does not give the name of the library in which the manuscript is preserved or the number which it bears. It is probably in the library of the Mechitarist monastery on the island of San Lazzaro.

⁶¹ Zohrab is said to have used twenty manuscripts in the New Testament part of his edition.

⁶² Uscan's edition, printed at Amsterdam in 1666, is not accessible to me. I have used the Serampore edition of 1817, which is a reprint of Uscan's work.

⁶³ Cf. J. A. Robinson in *Texts and Studies*, III, 3, pp. 83 ff.; and K. Lake, *op. cit.*, 44 f.

Caesarean type.⁶⁴ Conybeare believes that the New Testament was translated into Armenian twice before the end of the fourth century, once from Syriac by Sahak and once from Greek by Mesrop.⁶⁵ The problem is extremely complicated, and no one can discuss it adequately unless he be both an Armenist and a critic of the New Testament text. However, perhaps the present writer will be pardoned if he ventures to suggest that the Greek text used by Mesrop was Caesarean. In any case soon after the Council of Ephesus in 431 the Armenian translation was thoroughly revised by means of some Greek codices brought from Byzantium. These probably contained a text of the Antiochian type.⁶⁶ In this way it may be possible to explain the presence of Old Syriac, Caesarean, and Antiochian elements in existing Armenian manuscripts. The putting of Hebrews immediately after 2 Thessalonians is probably due to Caesarean influence, whereas the precedent for relegating the epistle to the end of the Pauline canon was probably furnished by the Antiochian codices used in making the above-mentioned revision of the Armenian text.

The Georgian tradition concerning the position of Hebrews is simpler. The original Georgian version was made from the Old Armenian translation probably not long after the completion of the latter, and in the fifth century it was radically revised with the aid of Greek manuscripts of the Antiochian type.⁶⁷ Hence most Georgian codices contain a text composed of Old Syriac, Caesarean, and Antiochian elements. Concerning the position of Hebrews in Georgian manuscripts the present writer has no

⁶⁴ This is the view which Professor F. Macler maintains in his book entitled '*Le texte arménien de l'évangile d'après Matthieu et Marc*' (Paris, 1919). For a critical review of Macler's work see R. P. Blake in *The Harvard Theological Review*, XV, 299 ff.

⁶⁵ Cf. F. H. A. Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* (fourth ed., 1894), II, 149 ff.

⁶⁶ Canon Streeter suggests that the Greek manuscripts employed in this revision may have been of the Caesarean type. He thinks that this hypothesis would 'explain the phenomena noted by Armitage Robinson, and also those brought forward by Macler.' Cf. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (New York, 1925), 104 f. It seems, however, to the present writer more probable that the codices which were obtained in Byzantium soon after the year 431 and were considered to be accurate copies contained the Antiochian text. This supposition would account for the Antiochian elements in the existing Armenian version.

⁶⁷ Cf. K. Lake, *op. cit.*, 44 f.

personal knowledge.⁶⁸ However, in two editions of the Georgian New Testament the Epistle to the Hebrews follows Philemon.⁶⁹ The assignment of the epistle to this place is doubtless due to Antiochian influence.

Ethiopic manuscripts are divided in respect to the position of Hebrews. Two codices written in the fourteenth century have the epistle immediately after 2 Thessalonians.⁷⁰ In most manuscripts, however, the Epistle to the Hebrews follows Philemon; but so far as their dates are known, these witnesses are all very late.⁷¹ The epistle is printed here also in Platt's edition of the Ethiopic New Testament;⁷² but no particular significance should be attributed to this fact, for Platt based his work on codices of inferior character and his edition has no critical value. Hebrews has the same position in the Ethiopic New Testament recently published by da Bassano and Gruson.⁷³

⁶⁸ A. A. Tsagareli, in his Catalogue of the Georgian Manuscripts in the Monastery of the Holy Cross at Jerusalem, mentions seven Georgian codices containing the Acts and Epistles; but he does not note the position of Hebrews in them. Cf. O. Wardrop in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XII, 2, pp. 170 f. Gregory lists no Georgian manuscripts of the Pauline Epistles which are not included in Tsagareli's catalogue. Cf. C. R. Gregory, *op. cit.*, II, 574 f. My colleague Professor R. P. Blake has kindly informed me that a Georgian manuscript in the Library of Iviron at Mount Athos (Cod. 11 Tsagareli = Cod. 42 Blake), which was written in 965 A.D., and Cod. Georg. 407 (saec. X) in the Library of the Society for the Extension of Literacy among the Georgians at Tiflis have the Epistle to the Hebrews immediately after 2 Thessalonians.

⁶⁹ Moscow (1816) and Tiflis (1879). The former of these is a reprint of the *editio princeps* of the Georgian Bible, which was published at Moscow in 1743. The *editio princeps* is a rare book, and the present writer has had no opportunity to consult it.

⁷⁰ Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Cod. Aeth. 27 (Zotenberg 45), dated 1378 A.D.; and *ibid.*, Cod. Aeth. 29 (Zotenberg 47). It is said that the text of Cod. Aeth. 27 differs from that of the London edition (1830) and often agrees with that of the Roman edition (1548-1549). Cf. C. R. Gregory, *op. cit.*, II, 563.

⁷¹ Gregory mentions twelve Ethiopic codices which have Hebrews after Philemon. Four of them are ascribed to the seventeenth century and three to the eighteenth, and in the case of five no date is given. Cf. C. R. Gregory, *op. cit.*, II, 559 ff.

⁷² London (1830). It was reprinted in London (1837) and in Basle (1874), and it was republished in revised form by Prätorius in Leipzig (1899). I have not seen the *editio princeps* of the Ethiopic New Testament, which was published in Rome in 1548-1549. It is said to contain many errors and is not significant for determining the position of Hebrews in the canon. The epistle was not printed with the rest of the Pauline corpus. It was included in the first volume of the work with the other New Testament books except the thirteen Pauline Epistles (1548). The latter were grouped together by themselves in the second volume (1549).

⁷³ Asmara (1920). The Old Testament, prepared by da Bassano, appeared in 1926.

This is doubtless the place which the epistle occupied in the Ethiopic canon at a later date, but in all probability it stood between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy in the earliest form of the Ethiopic New Testament. In respect to the position of Hebrews the two manuscripts mentioned above as having the epistle next after 2 Thessalonians undoubtedly represent primitive Ethiopic usage. The Ethiopic translation of the New Testament was made from Greek codices of a more or less Alexandrian type probably in the fifth or sixth century,⁷⁴ and the original form of the version doubtless followed these manuscripts in putting the Epistle to the Hebrews between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy. This translation was afterwards much modified by a mediaeval Arabic version, and it is this later form of the text that is found in late Ethiopic codices.⁷⁵

A few words must now be said about the position of Hebrews in the printed editions of the Greek New Testament. Erasmus (1516) and the editors of the Complutensian Polyglot (*c.* 1522) placed the Epistle to the Hebrews after Philemon. In so doing Erasmus followed the manuscripts he was using, in all of which Hebrews occupied this position.⁷⁶ The Complutensian scholars doubtless did likewise. The codices which they employed were late and of inferior value; and only one of them, which has long since disappeared, is now known.⁷⁷ There seems to be no way of finding out what other textual authorities were consulted by the editors of the New Testament part of the Complutensian Polyglot. Moreover, the Latin Vulgate, which was first printed soon after the middle of the fifteenth century, has the Pauline Epistles in this order; and it would never have occurred to the Spanish editors to put Hebrews in any other place.

Stephanus (1550) and the Elzevirs (1624) followed the precedent set by the earlier editors in regard to the position of Hebrews. The texts published in Paris and Leyden, which differed from each other only in minor respects, soon became standard

⁷⁴ Cf. I. Guidi, *Le Traduzioni degli Evangelii in Arabo e in Etiopico* (Rome, 1888), 33.

⁷⁵ Cf. I. Guidi, *op. cit.*, 34 ff.

⁷⁶ Codd. 1, 2, 4, and 7. Cf. C. R. Gregory, *op. cit.*, II, 930.

⁷⁷ Cod. Acts 52 (Paul 50). Stunica referred to this manuscript as *Codex Rhodiensis*. Cf. F. H. A. Scrivener, *op. cit.*, II, 179.

in Western Europe. A tradition was thus established, and the place of the Epistle to the Hebrews was fixed in accordance with the usage of the Western Church. This tradition was followed by the London Polyglot, which appeared in the year 1657.⁷⁸ Although variant readings are cited from Codex Alexandrinus for the first time in this monumental work, no mention is made of the fact that Hebrews comes immediately after 2 Thessalonians in this important manuscript.

The custom of putting the Epistle to the Hebrews at the end of the Pauline canon continued in vogue throughout the eighteenth century and during the first third of the nineteenth. Mill (1707), Wettstein (1751-1752), and Griesbach (1805) printed the epistle after Philemon. Each of these editors used at least five codices in which Hebrews stood between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy,⁷⁹ but they were interested in collecting variant readings and editing the text rather than in the order of the books of the New Testament. In this matter they simply followed the tradition which had prevailed since the time of the earliest printed editions of the Greek text.

Lachmann, whose first edition appeared in 1831, seems to have been the first to abandon the established custom of putting Hebrews at the end of the Pauline corpus. He printed the epistle next after 2 Thessalonians, thus giving it the place which it occupies in uncial manuscripts of the Alexandrian type. Tregelles (1857-1872), Tischendorf (1869-1872), and Westcott and Hort (1881), whose editions are based mainly on uncial codices of the above-mentioned type, also put the Epistle to the Hebrews between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy; and it has the same position in the editions of B. Weiss (1894-1900), Baljon (1898), and von Soden (1902-1913). On the other hand Nestle (1901),⁸⁰ Souter (1910), B. Weiss (1912), and Vogels

⁷⁸ The Antwerp Polyglot (1571-1572) and the Paris Polyglot (1630-1633) both have Hebrews after Philemon.

⁷⁹ Mill: Codd. A B 33 181 1908.

Wettstein: Codd. A C 91 94 181.

Griesbach: Codd. A C H 33 1908.

⁸⁰ In the first (1898) and second (1899) editions of Nestle's text Hebrews stands between 3 John and James. There is no ancient warrant for putting the epistle in this place.

(1920) revert to the earlier tradition and place Hebrews after Philemon.

This investigation of the position of Hebrews in the New Testament canon is instructive because it teaches the same lesson that is learned from similar inquiries in other departments of early Christian history. The canon and text of the New Testament, ecclesiastical organization, and Christian doctrine are all part of one great historical process. Diversity was everywhere the rule in the early period, whereas uniformity was the note of a later age. The Church was a universal or catholic fellowship. Local Christian communities, wherever they might be, were not isolated units. They were rather integral parts of a living organism, members of the body of Christ. Hence it was inevitable that in the course of time local usage should give way to more or less uniform standards of belief and practice. The spiritual unity of the Church tended to produce external uniformity.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- THE CHURCH AND ITS TEACHING TODAY. *By William Temple.* The William Belden Noble Lectures, 1935. Harvard University. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1936. Pp. ix, 49. \$1.00.
- COMMENTAIRES INÉDITS DES PSAUMES. Étude sur les Textes d'Origène continus dans le Manuscrit VINDOBONENSIS 8. Par René Cadiou. Collection d'Études anciennes. Paris, "Les Belles Lettres," 1936. Pp. 140. 25 francs.
- THE GIFTS OF THE HOLY GHOST. *By Frank Hudson Hallock.* New York, Morehouse Publishing Co., 1936. Pp. ix, 143. \$1.75.
- ADOLF VON HARNACK. *By Agnes von Zahn-Harnack.* Berlin, Hans Bott Verlag, 1936. Pp. 580. 7.50 marks.
- LA JEUNESSE D'ORIGÈNE. Histoire de l'École d'Alexandrie au Début du III^e Siècle. Par René Cadiou. Études de Théologie Historique. Paris, Gabriel Beauchesne, 1935. Pp. 424. 38 francs.
- THE MESSAGE OF ISRAEL. *Edited and compiled by Israel H. Weisfeld.* Twenty-four Essays and Sermons by outstanding orthodox conservative and reform Rabbis. With an Introduction by Meyer Waxman. New York, Bloch Publishing Co., 1936. Pp. xxxvii, 295. \$3.00.
- I PRIMI QUATTRO OSTRACA DI LAKIŠ. Umberto Cassuto. Estratto della "Rivista degli Studi Orientali," Vol. XVI. Roma, 1936. Pp. 15.
- DIE PROBLEMATIK DER RELIGIONEN. Eine religionsphilosophische Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der neuen Religionspsychologie. *By Wilhelm Keilbach.* Paderborn, Schöningh, 1936. Pp. 271. 4.30 marks.
- THE RESOURCES OF RELIGION. *By Georgia Harkness.* New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1936. Pp. xii, 218. \$2.00.
- STUDIA THEOLOGICA. I. Edidit Ordo Theologorum Universitatis Latviensis. Rigae, 1935.
- STUDIEN ZUM KOPTISCHEN BIBELTEXT. *By Jan Leunis Koole.* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 17. Berlin, Töpelmann, 1936. Pp. 101.